This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

1837
ARTES VERITAS SCIENTIA
LIBRARY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
E PLURIBUS UNUM
TUEBOR
SI QUAERIS PENINSULAM AMOENAM
CIRCUMSPICE

BR
1
.C5 [illegible]

THE
CHRISTIAN
REMEMBRANCER.

A

Quarterly Review.

VOL. XV.

JANUARY—JUNE.

LONDON:
PUBLISHED BY J. & C. MOZLEY,
6, PATERNOSTER ROW;
AND D. APPLETON & CO. 200, BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

1848.

LONDON:
R. CLAY, PRINTER, BREAD STREET HILL.

THE

CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

JANUARY, 1848.

ART. I.—*Hints on Glass-Painting.* *By* AN AMATEUR. Oxford: John Henry Parker. 1847.

A WORK of such pretensions as the one whose title stands at the head of this article, devoted entirely to the subject of glass-painting, suggests at once more than one important reflection independent of and previous to any judgment of the merits of the work itself. In the first place it is an indication that the spirit of revival in matters of ecclesiastical decoration is not extinct nor waning; in fact, although in some cases eccentric and extravagant efforts, resulting from the uncertainty necessarily attending the first steps of a radical change, may have given an uninviting aspect to the movement, there is enough of right and solid principle in it to ensure it some stability. We say it is an evidence of continued progress in *ecclesiastical* taste, because, however general the application of stained glass to ornamental purposes may be, there can be no doubt that the actual demand for its use in churches, as well as the higher quality of the work required, points out all secular employment of the art as secondary and subordinate. As for the taste itself, it may be stigmatized as visionary and unreal, or as dangerous and seductive; all such assaults it will survive, and its strongest symptoms of health and vitality consist in the daily extension of its influence among persons too much opposed in views to have adopted it as a party watchword. The charge of unreality rests on the belief that acts of church-restoration and adornment have only in view the indulgence of a taste or humour. Now if by this is meant a purely selfish indulgence, we do not believe the case is a common one where the sacrifice is liberal. If, however, its opponents mean merely that the enjoyment of the result, apart from a sense of duty, more than repays the devotion of a church-restorer, we will only say that the weakness, if it be one, is at least too amiable to be discouraged. If we knew any man who thought it worth while to sell that he had and give to

155183

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

BR
1
.C5

artists in several points. For instance, figures at a great elevation are exaggerated in height to counteract the shortening effect of perspective. This certainly seems to indicate something more than sheer ignorance of perspective as a motive for the conventional drawing of early English times. The arrangement of the lead-work and iron frames (in medallion windows) affords further evidence of both artistic and mechanical dexterity. The general merits of the style are thus summed up by the author: 'Notwithstanding their rudeness and defective drawing, 'the early English windows in general possess great merit. 'Simple and unaffected, they are often grandly conceived, though 'they may be imperfectly executed. A deep and lively feeling 'often pervades the entire figure, and its countenance, though 'exaggerated, exhibits expression and character. The early 'English artists were happy in their representations of deified 'and sainted personages.' And in allusion to the narrow lancet windows of this style, he says, 'The intensity of colours 'in windows diminished as the number and size of the windows 'themselves increased.' There is certainly a general approbation in this account, which hardly prepares us for the deliberate and unreserved rejection of the style, afterwards proclaimed. Windows of the decorated period assumed a less mosaic and more lively character, which is attributed partly to the introduction of the yellow stain at the beginning of the 14th century, which imparted a paler and more lemon-like tint than the pot-metal yellow glass which had been in use before. Severe drawing still characterized the figures, but of a more refined nature than that of the preceding style, and dignified by ample and flowing draperies. The foliage is natural, so as to be easily recognised, and the dark outlines of the design become less coarse and heavy than in the earlier specimens.

In the period which followed, that of the perpendicular style, began that fatal diminution in the intensity of tints, which, more and more encouraged as the artists' ambition of pictorial effect increased, ended at last in the washy imbecility of the purely enamel method. Still it was long before the subordination of glass to the architectural members of the building was so entirely lost sight of as it was in days when mullions and tracery were unsparingly swept away to make room for the broad divisions of a feeble transparency. The glass-stainer did what he could to force his art into prominence, without proceeding to this violence; his figures were expanded to nearly the full width and height of the respective lights they occupied, but the stone divisions of those lights circumscribed their growth, and the consequence of this half acknowledgment of their subordination was, a disproportion in the figures themselves, caused by their adaptation to the space allotted them, which made them low and squat. They were distinguished, however, by a repose, and freedom from forced or extravagant attitudes, which had not accompanied the bold, severe, and spirited drawing of the earlier styles. The grand characteristic of perpendicular glass, says the author, is delicacy, sometimes bordering on timidity, and general breadth of effect. And, he admits, the windows of this period lost in power what they gained in refinement. The foliage retrograded from the approach to nature made in decorated times, without recovering the crisp outline and bold effect of early English work. On the whole, the author does not seem to have much to say in favour of the perpendicular period; certainly not enough to support an assertion of its superiority to what preceded it.

Concurrently with the close of the perpendicular period in England, arose on the continent the Cinque Cento style, and afterwards prevailed for a time in our own country. Of this style it is as well to say at once, that the author of the work we are examining considers it the golden age of glass-painting, and still further limits this period of prosperity to the years between 1525 and 1535, during which it flourished in greatest perfection. So far as we discern, he gives it this preference solely on the ground of its more refined and correct drawing. In almost all other points it seems inferior to its predecessors. Windows of this date, though chiefly constructed on the mosaic system, have a less mosaic appearance than the earlier ones. The positive colours are qualified by the introduction of tints of less power and vivacity. An effect of distance and atmosphere was attempted, and, pictorially considered, the attempt was successful, but qualities much more valuable, as accessories to the building, were sacrificed for it. With all the finish of this style, there appears to have been a want of mechanical skill in some respects when compared with that of earlier times. For instance, the utmost pains were taken, we are told, to glaze the paintings so as to *conceal* the leads. How much more artistic was the employment of the leads in every intricate and graceful form, as the outline of the design itself, with the iron frames necessary to the stability of such a surface as a large early English lancet presents, wrought into the beautiful medallion forms into which the glass itself was composed! Least of all can the minor details of the style furnish the author's grounds of preference. The ornaments consist of foliage &c. intermixed with *genii*, *Cupids*, and angels, vases, candelabra, fruit, wreaths, festoons, cords and tassels! There would require at least some selection to fit them for the purposes of church-decoration. On the other hand, it is but fair to give, in the author's own warm terms of commendation, his opinion of the drawing and colouring in use at this time. ‘In technical knowledge of the ‘human figure,’ he says, ‘the glass-painters of this period cer‘tainly surpassed their predecessors, and their successors like‘wise. Its form and proportions are in general well preserved ‘in their work, and their pictures are often as well executed as ‘designed, a matter of very rare occurrence in glass-painting.’ And in spite of the decrease in depth and brilliancy of colours, which he acknowledges as a characteristic of the style, he says elsewhere, that during the ten years mentioned above, ‘Cinque ‘Cento glass-paintings display in general the most gorgeous ‘effects of colours, and the greatest contrasts of light and shade, ‘that have hitherto been attained in painted glass without sacri‘ficing the transparency of the material.’ He traces ‘the ‘superior pictorial qualities of the glass-paintings of the first ‘half of the sixteenth century’ to the progress made at that period in fresco and oil-painting. Finally, he concludes that during this period glass-painting reached a degree of excellence ‘which has not only never since been equalled, but also affords ‘a satisfactory ground for the belief that if glass-painting ‘cannot boast of possessing examples as full of artistic merit ‘as the works of the great masters, this deficiency is attri‘butable not to any inherent incapacity in this system of ‘painting for a display of high art, but simply to the want ‘of skill in those who have hitherto practised it.’

The so-called ‘Intermediate’ style, which is in fact no distinct style at all, but only a period of attempted revival, seems for that reason hardly to be numbered among the progressive styles from which our author had to make his choice. Still its characteristics do bear upon his views, because they illustrate the result of imitating ancient examples at all. At all events, this part of the work is worth notice here, as pointing out and accounting for the errors into which modern glass-painters have commonly fallen. The author does not flatter the artists of his own day. ‘Modern imitations of ‘the ancient style are,’ he says, ‘distinguished by a display ‘of the imperfect drawing of the ancient artists without any ‘of their feeling or inspiration.’ ‘The erroneous notion that ‘nothing besides brilliancy of colour is required in a glass‘painting has engendered the cultivation of a low species of ‘art, and the servile imitation of the grotesque and extravagant ‘drawing of the middle ages.’ Against this truly Chinese fidelity of imitation he justly protests, though he does not appear to have a very clear apprehension of a more liberal principle. The French are said to employ higher artistic talents in the pursuit than ourselves, and consequently to be more successful in catching the spirit of their models. But it is not want of taste or skill alone which makes our rescripts of ancient models so unsuccessful. Physical causes are leagued against us. For instance, the very rudeness and defective working of the machinery employed in the manufacture of ancient glass was a source of beauty when it was used for ornamental purposes. The flimsy, though unblemished material of our own day is far less effective than the thick, rugged, coarse, uneven, half-opaque substance which was the vehicle of rich, deep colours in the middle ages. Still we suppose there is an analytical process by which the progressive improvements in the manufacture of glass may be made to retrograde, till a voluntary rudeness is reached for this special purpose, leaving the refinements of modern invention available for ordinary use. We are not aware whether this has been tried.

While on the subject of modern imitations, the author gives his view of the causes which led to the decay of the art at the close of his favourite style. 'Glass-painting,' he says, 'deteriorated not in consequence of any want of encouragement, for 'the causes of its decline were in full operation at the period of 'its greatest prosperity, [the Cinque Cento style, we presume,] 'but from confounding its principles with those of other systems 'of painting, from a disregard of its peculiar conditions and distinctive character.' In short, its decline was the natural issue of that principle of decay which, as we have intimated, all art inherits, and which naturally shows itself just at the time when any branch of it has put forth its full power of growth. Perhaps it was hardly necessary to assure the public that 'the Reformation did not corrupt the art, and that the mosaic system of 'glass-painting would equally have been forgotten had it never 'taken place.'

Having completed his survey of the styles, the author, or, in place of a somewhat wearisome circumlocution, Mr. Winston, (for it is hardly presumptuous, we believe, thus to interpret the initials at the end of the preface) looks at them collectively in order to make his selection, and pronounce, *ex cathedrâ*, (for there is no English writer of equal pretensions on the subject) what style church-builders and church-restorers shall adopt. We can fancy that he must have done so with considerable embarrassment, judging both from his manner of considering the subject throughout, and from the conclusion to which he comes. He seems persuaded that the earlier styles exhibit brilliancy and depth of colour, with grandeur of conception and general solemnity of character, all however inseparable from preposterous and outrageously false drawing. On the other hand, in the latest of all genuine styles, he discerns correct drawing and unshackled pictorial display, not unattended, certainly, with a deterioration in tints, and (though he says, and appears to think, little of this point,) with a disregard of the architectural members to which it should be subordinate. Having attained this conviction, he next determines that edification and all the higher objects of the art require that good drawing should be the primary consideration, and therefore that if any ancient style be reproduced, it ought to be the Cinque Cento. But Mr. Winston (as might be expected) is only relatively satisfied with this (perhaps the genii and Cupids, the festoons and tassels of the style are perplexing to him), and he boldly resolves to cut the knot by recommending *no* ancient style for general use, but clearing a path for one entirely new. Accordingly, with many apologies for his originality, he proceeds to throw out suggestions for the formation of a new style. And first he endeavours, as a preliminary step for his own guidance, to investigate the principles which should be kept in view by a painter on glass. His first proposition is excellent. An artist, he says, ought to endeavour to develope the resources of his particular branch of painting to the fullest extent, but not to seek excellences which are incompatible with its inherent properties. The translucency of glass-painting enables it to display effects of light and colour beyond all other modes, but the same quality involves certain defects, *e. g.* a limited scale of colours and an inherent flatness for want of transparent shadow. Another peculiarity, *viz.* its mechanical construction with respect to lead-work and saddle-bars, excludes several applications of design, for instance, landscapes (except in back-grounds) long perspective views of interiors, fore-shortened groups, &c. These peculiarities must be either evaded or turned to account. The painter is bound to exhibit the translucency of glass, which is easily done in patterns, but far more difficult in pictorial designs, but, at the same time with the translucency, he must display the effect of atmosphere and distance. So, at least, says Mr. Winston, and proposes to accomplish it by using clear lights, transparent (stippled) shadows, strong contrasts of light and shade, and, lastly, narrow leads, which he recommends even at the risk of sacrificing security from weather. All these, however, may be recovered from the ancient styles, and therefore the necessity of a new one must arise only from the requirements of the design in outline.

After so grave an investigation of first principles, the reader will be disposed to expect more originality in Mr. Winston's professedly new style than he is likely to find. So far as we can understand a somewhat indistinct course of suggestions, his plan goes no further than the adoption of the existing styles respectively, in all their leading features, according to the date of the building in which they are to be embodied, with such a transmutation as would result from rectified drawing, and some few other emendations of less importance. Now surely, even granting that an attention to these points would create any considerable deviation from ancient precedents, this is hardly to set up a new style, any more than if an architect should build a church, following in its outline models of the twelfth or thirteenth century, but aided in its execution by the newly-invented instruments and improved manual skill of our own times. But the truth is, as we believe, that correct drawing, &c. would not really effect any change in the true character of ancient glass-painting at all. The author himself takes special pains to impress upon us that incorrect drawing is no essential element in the spirit of the ancient styles, but a mere accidental deficiency. And we have the authority of one not less learned in the subject than even Mr. Winston, and more practically acquainted with it—one whose attainments in the art have gained him the highest patronage which France, his own country, can bestow—for saying that those who search for the very best examples, such as are the real types of their respective styles, will find the most excellent drawing in the early periods. M. Gerente, in his recent visit to this country, has displayed a depth of information which makes him no despicable ally to those who, with him, are disposed to maintain the thirteenth century as the true golden age of glass-painting, against Mr. Winston with his devotion to the sixteenth. If, then, even accurate and beautiful drawing is among the attributes of the early styles, what becomes of Mr. Winston's cry for change on the plea of inferiority in this respect? *Parturiunt montes:* we cannot see that his suggestions amount to anything like the sketch of a new style.

If necessary, it is quite possible to take considerable liberties with the ancient styles, and it may be advantageous to introduce new forms and features as well as to refine upon the old. Nay more, it would not be very difficult, as the last half century has shown, to design windows entirely without regard to any precedent whatever. And this method of proceeding would certainly be new, so far as any reverence for antiquity is concerned, though its ignorance and lawlessness are, we imagine, prominent characteristics of the whole course of our author's 'Intermediate style.' But even if we had no results of the system before us as warnings, it would be a bold and incongruous experiment, since we do not profess to abandon all precedent in the composition of the structure itself which the glass is designed to adorn. This method, however, it is fair to say, is very far from what the author proposes. He has a vague idea of the growth of a new eclectic style of universal application out of the several distinct styles of antiquity, combining the merits and rejecting the faults of all, without being classed under any one. Now we think this cannot well be. Glass-painting must be subordinate, and cannot be independent. The painter has not to design a picture, but to adorn a building, and that building will either be an ancient one, or a new one formed on the principles of the old. Hence there will not only be associations in the general aspect of the place demanding a chronological conformity in the glazing of the windows, but the very construction of the fabric — the hard, unbending masonry, will limit or expand the design, according to the style, in such a way as to make as strong a line of demarcation between periods in glass as in stone. At least, if the character of the different architectural styles be at all observed in glazing, we cannot ourselves realize such a consanguinity between the design for an early lancet and a broad perpendicular seven-light window, as can bring them together as examples of one and the same style. There seems to be some confusion in the author's mind between refinements upon an old style and the origination of a new one. When an entirely new style in architecture is started, it may be attended by an equally original movement in glass-painting; but any such movement would be premature if designed to introduce novelty into one portion of a structure substantially unchanged.

Admitting, however, that defective drawing is not so inseparable from early examples as to put them out of the pale of imitation, and that M. Gerente's view of the period of perfection in glass-painting is more just than Mr. Winston's, backed, as the former is, by a triumphant appeal to our own Cathedral of Canterbury, still there is scope enough for genius and judgment in modern artists. Even if in design we closely follow existing precedents, there is sufficient variety among them to exercise at least the faculty of selection. For instance, there is no one style, we suppose, from Norman to Cinque Cento, which does not in some measure allow us the option (no unimportant one) of employing either groups in action, or single figures. Again, though the figures of the different periods respectively have a peculiar and distinctive character, of repose in one case, of more excited action in another, still this is not so indispensable to the propriety of the style selected that any deviation in obedience to individual taste amounts to an innovation in style. Here, then, are two points, at any rate, fairly open to discussion; points, too, of considerable interest and importance, since they influence not only the mere pictorial effect of a window, but also the amount and character of the edification which may result from the contemplation of it. Yet these points, and all questions connected with the composition of glass-painting, are omitted by our author on the ground that they do not fall within the province of an amateur. (Preface, p. 5.) This is a view which we cannot quite apprehend. For our own part, we should have considered that such questions of taste and propriety fell far more within the jurisdiction of an amateur than the dry though important facts, and profusion of technical details, which our author has collected with such incredible patience and perseverance.

The two questions which have presented themselves to us, out of many which might arise, are really less distinct than they may appear at first sight to be. The alternative of groups or single figures involves in a considerable degree that of repose or action. A group must be actually historical, or, at least, possess so much action as to connect the figures with one another. On the other hand, violent action in a single figure is unintelligible, except by an extraordinary effort of the imagination.

Reducing these, therefore, to one question, it is obvious that historical groups or figures in action will operate upon the spectator otherwise than single figures, and those in attitudes of repose, or such conventional postures as do not require that the imagination should supply other figures to join in the action, and consider the scene as one directly historical. The former would edify undoubtedly, for pictures are the poor man's books, and they would impress upon the mind historical events and even doctrinal facts of which he might otherwise be ignorant. Nor would this effect be confined to the unlettered. The most refined and intellectual among us may with advantage be made to realize what we have learnt, by seeing it thus embodied, if the design is correctly conceived and faithfully executed. It cannot, therefore, be desirable entirely to exclude historical groups, such as the scenes of the Gospel, or of Church history, from glass-painting. Still we conceive that this sort of edification is not its highest function. A church is not, except secondarily, a place of instruction: 'My house is the 'house of prayer.' Hence we consider that the proportion of directly historical representations should not be greater than that of catechetical instruction in our systems of devotion to the portions designed for meditation and prayer. A solitary figure offered to our contemplation, not *acting* its history, but tranquilly indicating it by some conventional symbol; not seeking to refresh our memory, but to stimulate our devotion and provoke our zeal,—harmonizes most with the solemn purpose of a consecrated building. We do not gain from representations of even the noblest actions of the lives of saints an equally high sense of the change which has taken place in those who have gone before us as examples, with that which results from their mysterious influence when drawn up, as it were, in inactive, passionless rows, watching ceaselessly and unwearied the devotions of those who are ever less ready to pray than God to hear. These latter teach us more truly the relation between the departed and ourselves.

> 'The Saints are there, the Living Dead,
>   The Mourners glad and strong;
> The sacred floor their quiet bed,
> Their beams from every window shed
>   Their voice in every song.'
>
> *Lyra Innocentium* (*Church Windows*).

The terrible details of a martyrdom, for instance, call our thoughts indeed to the sufferer, and awaken a due admiration of his fortitude, a due abhorrence of his persecutors' malice. But the still effigy, divested of all action connected with the events and conduct of life on earth, and shadowing, so far as is lawful, the condition of life in heaven—the face cleared from all emotion and all sense of self—the attitude of benediction or warning concerning those who remain behind—all these point with peculiar precision and impressiveness to the preparation we must enter upon for the things to come.

When we have made our determination respecting the adoption of groups or single figures, when we have resolved on the degree of historical action which our figures shall display, there yet remain several questions to be considered either in borrowing from ancient examples or in original design. There is the great question, what the subject of the design shall be, what must be excluded on principles of faith or taste, and what will best serve the highest purposes of the art. We call it a great question, because obviously upon a right decision must depend the worth of the art itself, and its influences for good or evil. At the same time, we believe that both the current feeling and traditionary usage are sufficient to preclude the necessity of very stringent directions on this head; and therefore it is that we could wish omitted from the work such passages as treat the subject in a theological and controversial point of view. We allude chiefly to the chapter 'On the employment of painted glass as a means of decoration,' in which our author seems to display a less sense of the modesty becoming an amateur in theological matters than he professes as an amateur in glass-painting. His theology is, however, of a very negative character, consisting chiefly of fine-drawn objections, nice distinctions, and strong protests against rather visionary evils. Protesting, indeed, seems to be his special delight. A painted window, he says, 'in a *Protestant* church, should be of a *Protestant* character, and accordingly free from those legends and symbols for 'which *Protestants* have neither reverence nor belief.' If the reverence and belief of a Protestant majority is exacted, the glass-painter's catalogue of legends and symbols is likely to be a limited one indeed. We shall soon obtain our author's limitation of them in a more definite and tangible shape. He justifies the use of portraits of the saints, on the ground that 'no one 'can suppose that either portraits of saints or other scriptural 'subjects are introduced into a church with any other view than 'for the purpose of ornament, or, *possibly*, of example and in'struction.' For our own part, we would not give much for an art which professes to serve the church with *mere* ornament; and that which Mr. Winston regards as a *possible* object, viz., food for meditation, and a source of example and instruction, seems to us the sole, legitimate, and adequate end for which the subject is worth cultivating, or, we had almost said, Mr. Winston's book worth reading. But even this not very bold concession to the claims of the saints to the services of Christian art is diluted with a further protestation. 'Against the repre'sentation of unscriptural subjects, there is in *Protestant* minds a 'general and well-founded objection.' At first we were disposed to quarrel with this restriction, in the fear that it would exclude such subjects as the proto-martyrdom of England from the churches of St. Alban—the dawn of Christianity upon our Saxon ancestors from those of St. Augustine, &c.; but upon further reading we were satisfied that the author's interpretation of a scriptural subject is a liberal one. He advocates a rule which 'gives free admission to the *Protestant* martyrs, and the 'Fathers of the Anglican Church;' though at the same time he prohibits (we presume as unscriptural) certain other 'objects, 'which, though not legendary, are hardly of a *Protestant* charac'ter.' These objects are 'the instruments of the Crucifixion, 'such as the nails, the hammer, the ladder, the scourge, the 'crown of thorns, &c.,' to which, he says, *Protestants* do not allow sufficient importance to justify the affectation of it by giving them a prominent place in our designs. We believe they do not. In the same vein of satire upon his own times, the author declares that his opinion is decidedly hostile to symbols, because 'to some persons they are offensive, to most they are 'unintelligible, and in very few, perhaps, of those who do under'stand their meaning, are they capable of awakening any senti'ments of piety or veneration;' because, 'if any interest 'attaches to ancient symbols, it is an antiquarian interest,' and because 'we know that the modern copies are an unreal 'mockery, the production not of a congenial mind, but a mere 'mechanical hand.' Severe as this sarcasm is, (and surely we cannot be wrong in regarding this language as no other than a piece of delicate but cutting irony) it is a relief, after the dry technical details which form the substance of this amateur production.

But before we draw to a conclusion, there are some points remaining which seem to deserve discussion, although there is little to suggest them in the volumes before us, perhaps because they seem to approach too nearly the question of composition and design, which Mr. Winston considers that an amateur is bound to relinquish. In the case of figures, for instance, the disposition and character of the drapery are worth considering, since on them will greatly depend the solemnity and propriety of the painting. Now, while we agree with our author that we are under no obligation to follow closely the drawing of ancient glass-paintings, we must be careful to distinguish between peculiarities founded on principle, and those which are the result of accident or imperfect knowledge and manual skill; and therefore we should be sorry to consider as an open question the proportion which drapery should bear to the figure in extent. It may be said, perhaps with truth, that the long flowing draperies of saints are purely conventional, and such as were not and could not be worn under the circumstances represented. But like the unnaturally tall figures in very elevated early English windows, this was no result of ignorance or want of skill. The reverential spirit of ancient painters revolted from an arrogant display of the limbs, from any unnecessary obtrusion of the humanity of their subjects. The same, in almost the same degree, is exhibited in the more devotional pictures of Raffaelle,—and who can charge *him* with ignorance or want of skill? Majestically draped as many of his figures are, every limb was first drawn naked in the painter's studio, nay, every muscle was assigned to its place with consummate anatomical knowledge; and when the figure stood veiled before the vulgar eye, no defective drawing was hidden, no negligence excused by that reverential treatment of the subject. In our own times, the painter who brings a smattering of anatomy to his aid, is uneasy if all are not reminded of the accomplishment thus accessory to his fame, and burns for naked subjects. There is a nauseous profanity in certain painters who choose a saint as a field for the play of a prurient imagination, and love to employ their pencil on reiterated forms of the humbled Magdalene, because it enables them to show their skill in imitating flesh. Those who have frequented the exhibitions of late years will not be at a loss for an illustration of what we mean. But, setting aside the claims of religious veneration, as a mere act of policy, the glass-painter will clothe his figures in long and ample draperies, for he will scarcely meet with any greater mechanical difficulty in his art than the proper representation of flesh of large extent on glass. We trust, therefore, that this conventionality will never cease to be observed.

But the mere length of garments, though it may secure propriety, will not produce dignity. And it *is* the modern artist's province, by study and experiment, to attain to a majestic disposition of the folds of drapery. We cannot venture to suggest any rule on this head. Of course, something of severity will be acknowledged as required in an ecclesiastical painting; but this may be effected by the most opposite treatment. Let any one, for instance, set side by side some of Albert Durer's wood-engravings and the designs of Flaxman. In the former, (as in the German and Italian painters who preceded A. Durer), the folds are numerous, strongly marked, and angular. In Flaxman's figures the drapery is defined by very few bold but undulating strokes; yet in both of these there is a common element of severity. The same fact is displayed by a comparison of early ecclesiastical paintings with classical sculpture; yet, the study of the latter was greatly cultivated by the early painters, and their choice of a different method to produce somewhat the same effect is as difficult to be traced to a motive as it certainly commends itself in the result. One point in which the experience of the artist will be brought to bear upon this question will be, the distribution of light and shade. The sharp, small, frequent folds of ancient drapery would tend to scattered and unvaried light. How far this would be an evil in a transparent material we are not prepared to say.

The demand for memorial windows (happily an increasing one) suggests some difficulties which the glass-painter has to overcome peculiarly in this case. He will be expected to introduce at least some characteristic symbol of the person commemorated; and he ought to be well acquainted with all the ancient methods of accomplishing this by monograms, rebuses, merchants' marks, badges of trades and professions, patron saints, &c. But it is not improbable that he will also have occasion to pourtray the person of the deceased, and, perhaps, that of the donor of the window. In this case an immediate difficulty presents itself in the unsightliness of modern costume. It is true that the difficulty is not peculiar to this branch of art. It has evidently been the enigma of sculptors, painters, and artists in general for centuries past, that is, ever since the revival of pagan art in England. Hence it is that, whereas our statesmen and generals have invariably argued or fought their way to distinction in swallow-tailed coats and trousers, their friends commonly consider them best commemorated in a bare neck, flowing toga, and sandals. Half of our metropolitan public statues, if they were gifted with a little more of the spirit and accuracy of classical sculpture, would seem likely to delude future generations into the belief that their originals were among the adventurers who came over, not, like our old English gentry, with William the Conqueror, but, somewhat earlier, with Julius Cæsar. And yet in the only case in which a conventional dress could be adopted with full propriety, that of ecclesiastics, to whom belongs of right an attire more solemn and picturesque than they commonly assume, this method of solving the problem seems never to have entered into the heads of artists. Chantrey, for instance, who clothes Mr. Pitt and the Duke of Wellington, so far as he clothes them at all, in a foreign and unmeaning garb, makes exertions, not less obvious than unsuccessful, to give dignity to the real costume of Bishop Heber and other bishops whom he has transmitted to posterity, as types of what a bishop is, externally at least, in our days. The mitre and staff, and all those vestments whose symbolical propriety is as inseparable from the episcopate now as when they were its ordinary garb, seem never to have occurred to him as materials ready to his hand for the due and decent representation of his subject. In the case of secular persons, however, the painter has still to grapple with the difficulties of modern costume. We need hardly protest against the unreality of returning to a more picturesque but inappropriate and exploded dress. On the other hand the colourless and shapeless vestments in which our limbs are commonly clad form no ornamental feature in a painted window. Where royalty, nobility, any office of state, or an academical position or degree, offers a peculiar and less vulgar costume, the difficulty is comparatively small; but very often these facilities will be withheld. In this case the figure should occupy a very subordinate position in the window, so as not to challenge notice, and a devotional attitude will go far to dignify any inevitable vulgarity.

Having noticed some unfavorable points in Mr. Winston's book, we will not withhold the great praise to which some parts of it are entitled. The care with which the illustrations have been executed is very praiseworthy. Nearly all are copied from actual tracings of the originals, either reduced or precise facsimiles. The author has not commonly availed himself of the labours of others, but examined, traced, and coloured, expressly for the work in hand. Even the quality of the material is often expressed in his illustrations, as, for instance, the streaky appearance of ancient ruby-glass. But even the pictorial part of the volumes displays the same timid and low view of his task which forbids his giving any theory of composition and design, or anything beyond dry facts, with a few moral and theological sentiments. The examples chosen are not such as display the greatest beauty and purity, but those which best illustrate his descriptions of distinctions in manner of execution or mechanical peculiarities. After all, however, as we have before intimated, there is no other English book which can serve the same purpose as this is calculated to serve. And, so far as we have ascertained, the same may be said of foreign works on the subject. There are more splendid and more original publications, such as the yet incomplete one of M. Lasteyrie, and there are several recent French and German pamphlets upon stained glass, but this is the first attempt at a manual.

ART. II.—*The Expedition to Borneo of H.M.S. Dido, for the Suppression of Piracy: with Extracts from the Journal of* JAMES BROOKE, ESQ., *of Sarawak, (now Her Majesty's Commissioner and Consul-General to the Sultan and independent Chiefs of Borneo.)* *By* CAPTAIN THE HON. HENRY KEPPEL, R.N. Third Edition. *With an additional Chapter, comprising recent Intelligence, by* WALTER K. KELLY. In 2 vols. London: Chapman & Hall. 1848.

THERE is a charm about the idea of a beautiful island which the imagination lays hold of with avidity. An insular position, either literally or metaphorically, gives intensity and vividness. Be a thing good or bad, beautiful or deformed, full of pleasant, happy thoughts, or fraught with terrors, it is the more so from being alone, for the imagination loves solitude, and delights in working out one idea undisturbed by a multiplicity of forces. The stranger, the widow, and the orphan, apart from higher motives, have ever been the subjects of poetic sympathy from the loneliness of their condition. Distress is aggravated by desolation; deformity is most hideous when made the mark of exclusion; while superstitious alarms are more quickly excited at the idea of one mighty, overwhelming creature of the fancy, stalking all in solitude and darkness, than by the thought of innumerable little imps, however troublesome and nasty they may be. Again, if we would apply the same argument to our notions of comfort and security, it is an obvious illustration to appeal to the idea of a man's home being his castle. Bars and bolts, forms and manners of society, and such exclusive influences add much to our domestic enjoyments. This is well described by Leigh Hunt in his amusing, though in some respects not very commendable work, 'Men, Women, and Books,' with regard to the furthest retreat of all in private life—the centre keep of the domestic castle we have alluded to. 'Bed is the home of home; the innermost part of the 'content. It is sweet within sweet; a nut in the nut; within 'the snuggest nest a snugger nest; my retreat from the publicity 'of my privacy; my room within my room, walled (if I please) 'with curtains; a box, a separation, a snug corner, such as 'children love when they play at "house;" the place where I 'draw a direct line between me and my cares; where I enter 'upon a new existence, free, yet well invested; reposing, but 'full of power; where the act of lying down, and pulling the 'clothes over one's head, seems to exclude matters that have 'to do with us when dressed and on our legs.' We ascend, however, to more imaginary pictures—to scenes which we know more of from the indulgences of hope than from the gratification of experience. What is most often the local habitation of a child's poetic fancies? What was the blissful retreat of Homer's wandering hero? What is the Utopia of many speculations and many plans, political, economical, philosophical? What is the brightest dream to the weary of the world's cares and troubles? What is the passing fancy of many an enthusiastic moment? Is it not to find a pleasant island encompassed by the dark blue ocean—to wander from shore to shore through fertile plains, by the side of romantic streams, or under the bold outline of a mountain range: with or without company, how many, or of what sort, depending on circumstances, we need not discuss. But the question will next occur, Where should the island be? To the *excitable* inhabitants of Tipperary, perhaps it might appear that, if cleansed of the cowardly Saxons, and freed from the restraining obligations of rent, no colour would contrast so well with the before-mentioned ocean blue, as the bright Emerald Isle; but to quote in this case the words of a graver censure '*in hac parte nullam ejus fiduciam habemus*,' we like not the results which follow Tipperary excitement, and therefore do not recommend any, but such as in a very literal way are wearied with the busy world, to fix on Ireland as the realization of their Utopian aspirations.

We have moreover a decided admiration for a certain great luminary, which, in our humble judgment, exercises a powerful influence in brightening up the dull elements of which this earth is composed. Cheering as its inner strata may be to the speculating eye of the geologist, we yet feel confident that the particular part of it which is exposed to the light and heat of the sun will ever be most popular and most generally admired. If any one is inclined to be sceptical, let him descend the dark regions of a coal-pit, or even let him wander through limestone caverns with all their beauties of stalactites, stalacmites, and the many varieties of glistening spars; let him do this on a fine sunny day, and on emerging from below, let him cast his eyes around, and let him feel the warm beams of the sun. Then he will perceive what a glorious influence the sun has on all that meets its joyous face. In contrast with the dark, cold, and damp regions he has quitted, all will appear like fairyland; for a few brief moments he will think of Paradise, where every sense drinks in a spontaneous draught of most pleasing sensations,

But to jump to our conclusion without further delay, we think that the sunny climes of the tropics have the best claim to be the residence of such fairy-like islands as imagination pictures. The geography of the world seems to sanction our judgment. No part of the globe is so sprinkled with islands as the torrid zone; the slightest glance at a map will show almost a girdle of Oceanides from the eastern shore of Africa to the west of America; and between these two continents there are the West Indies, with many scattered isles from those of Cape Verd to St. Helena. The propriety of this is obvious; the sun, though wonderful in its effects, yet, like all other mechanical powers, requires something to work on, some material which it is to use as its instrument, some fulcrum to move the world. Its insatiable thirst demands oceans of water, if the land, which dares to look him point blank in the face, is to profit by such fiery contact. As in a steam-engine you must proportion the elements of fire and water to produce power, or even to avoid disastrous effects; so you must have water if the sun is to produce fertility, and you must have it in proportion to the sun's power. The vast and dreary deserts of central Africa are a monument of the destructive powers of heat where its thirst is unquenched. The temperate zones are undoubtedly the proper places for large continents, as on land removed from the equator the supply of water required is not so great, and also, it is allowed to accumulate. The only continent indeed, besides Africa, through which the equator runs, is South America, and its course is there followed by the mighty Amazon, with its thousand tributaries irrigating with no mean supply of water the whole breadth of the continent, from the lofty table-lands of the Cordilleras on the west, to the Atlantic on the eastern shore.

We know that in extolling a tropical climate, we are running counter to many dearly-bought opinions as to health and home comforts, and that we are also offending the poetical prejudices which linger round the succession of the seasons in the temperate regions of the earth. We like the modest budding of spring, the permanent luxuriance of a moderately hot summer, the richness of autumnal fruits, and the tints of departing verdure; we even cling, from the wholesome power of association, to the bitter frosts of winter; we would not willingly give up the cheerful fireside evenings, made doubly sweet by contrast with the external weather. Our religious prejudices are enlisted in favour of the temperate zones; we almost feel that we are morally tied to these regions—so shocking to the sensibilities would it be to sit down to the good fare of Christmas-day under the full blaze of a sun which made it requisite that all culinary operations, or even all the arrangements of a social party, should be conducted after quite a different system. Nor are we disposed rashly to find fault with such views; they have much good feeling at the bottom of them, and it is very unnecessary that they should be interfered with where no practical object is in view. Yet we think it must be admitted by the most strenuous admirer of our temperate seasons, with all their agreeable associations, that many days of the year, even in happy England, are not the brightest which an imaginative mind could picture, if called on to describe an earthly paradise, or to luxuriate in eloquent phrases of the full beauty and fertility of nature. We have but to look up from our paper to behold an horizon but dimly visible betwixt earth and heaven, yet itself the only distinguishable outline to separate the misty drizzle above from the same below. But a small portion of the year does, in fact, realize the beauties we attribute to it in idea. Yet we do not find fault with this our climate; it has done noble service, and we wish it well: but, may not those who truly admire nature be excused if they praise other climes where her powers are more strongly developed?—where her vital essence is more vigorous and quick in its productive energies? If there is a wonder in the small acorn which becomes an oak; if there is beauty in the humble garland of flowers gathered from the hedge side; if there is luxuriance in the wooded hills that overhang some rippling stream; if there is splendour in a wide prospect of fertile lands, rich valleys, and bold, undulating forests, as seen over the foreground of a well preserved English country mansion; if there is beauty in all this, may not the more adventurous imagination of the soul be excused if one wishes to see the same lovely dame, who shows so fair a prospect fifty-three degrees north of the equator, revelling in the enjoyment of her own energetic freedom, under what may be called her high-pressure force?

Again, as regards health: there is no doubt that hot climates do not suit all European constitutions; nor is it to our point that they should, as we have no wish to encourage a general migration forthwith, as a simple-minded Dyak of Borneo proposed to Mr. Brooke; on the contrary, if our counsel were asked in a certain high quarter, we should decidedly recommend that Her Majesty had better pause before she undertakes such an expedition. Yet, we do not think that this objection is of such an insuperable nature as some may imagine. The tropical regions are not entirely composed of parched sandy deserts and deadly swamps: these are only the exceptions, and can be easily avoided in the countries we would at present call attention to.

The island of Borneo, so prominently under the notice of the public just now, in consequence of Mr. Brooke's achievements, is, in many respects, from the brilliant accounts we receive of it, almost such an island as we have attributed to the dreams of fancy; we hear it called, the 'Eden of the eastern wave.'

It is not, indeed, quite small enough to be the wished-for retreat of a solitary misanthropist; compared with such individual romance, it is a vast continent; but if we look on it as likely to become an appendage to our own wide empire, it maintains its character of being strictly an island, and may claim all the poetic advantages which belong to that species of land. The natural advantages of an insular position, it certainly enjoys; for, though being on the equator itself, which pierces its very centre, it has no lack of water, both in the form of rivers and refreshing rains; these make the land fertile, almost to the satisfying of human cupidity, and also so moderate and regulate the heat of a tropical sun, as, from the idea which the book before us conveys, to render it perfectly habitable, or even in many situations a most delightful climate for European residents.

The peculiar advantages which the island of Borneo enjoys, we will enter into more fully as we proceed with our review of Mr. Brooke's Journal. A few prefatory remarks of our own on the subject of such islands generally, we have ventured to make, in order to bring the particular case before us under the notice of our readers in a manner to attract, rather than, as is too often the case, to repel a poetical view of the subject. Poetry, by which we understand high sentiment and true nobleness of action, is the element of all real improvement and all true civilization; and it is the utter want of this—the consideration only of what a certain school of philosophy would call the *material* in opposition to the *spiritual*—which has been the cause of the little progress which European colonization has made in the improvement of the natives. Grasping avarice has been proved by the Dutch, to be in the end most short-sighted policy. After long possession of many islands in the Eastern Archipelago, they have now but little hold over them, and have derived but little profit from them. But take our own lamentable treatment of islands and continents somewhat further south. When parts of Australia and Van Dieman's Land came into our possession, how did we use them? Did we estimate such fair gifts as we ought? did we look on them as about to become, through our government, the future scenes of noble and high deeds, or did we strive to make them provinces for the spread of Christ's Church, where all the blessings of time and eternity might take root downwards and bear fruit upwards? This we should say would have been the view with which Christian romance would instinctively have taught us to regard these extensions of our empire. But instead of this, we filled them with our refuse, as we throw dirt together in a heap in the remotest part of our premises. We made them the sink of our vices, and peopled distant lands with men, who having been, from the nature of the case, violators of human and divine law during their home life—having been hardened and corrupted by the exposure of a public conviction and association with their brethren in crime, and having further been so located in those countries as to banish, humanly speaking, all hope of repentance—become at last such demons of iniquity as to make our own devices, that were meant for our good, to recoil on us to our hurt. Here again was a selfish and short-sighted expediency, in the treatment of distant lands placed by Providence under our control, proved at last to be bad policy. More righteous would it be in the beginning, and more politic would it be in the end, if, taught by experience, we were to regard new possessions with nobler sentiments than avarice or short-sighted political selfishness can suggest, and to look on ourselves as being entrusted with moral responsibilities. The first step in this higher treatment of what is bestowed upon us, will consist partly in higher views of the wonderful works of God in the material world; but chiefly the Christian principle of the honour due to all men, be they wild and savage, deceitful, or helpless—or, more difficult than all, be they obstinate in their hostility to our notions of improvement.

We now turn, however, from our own speculations and our own conclusions, to the well-weighed opinions and practical experience of Mr. Brooke. But first, we cannot forbear offering that gentleman our warmest testimony to the excellent spirit in which all his undertakings have been carried through. Mr. Brooke exemplifies the maxim that honesty is the best policy: honesty in his case, consisting in a very exact appreciation of what was morally due to himself, to his country, and to the native inhabitants with whom he had to deal, and that in most varied and difficult circumstances. He was on many occasions heroically brave; on others he might have been thought, if we knew not the result, almost apathetically patient; and throughout he was uniformly considerate, kind, and the sincere friend of all around him, especially of the oppressed. With the small means at his disposal but a few years ago, and the extreme absence of all hurry throughout his proceedings, he reminds us of the more praiseworthy of two characters described by the son of Sirach: 'There is one that laboureth, and 'taketh pains, and maketh haste, and is so much the more 'behind. Again, there is another that is slow, and hath need 'of help, wanting ability and full of poverty; yet the eye of 'the Lord looked upon him for good, and set him up from his 'low estate.' He ever seems possessed with the true confidence that patience and courage in a good cause can alone give. Throughout his expedition, it is obvious that much of his success arose from the fact, that he was responsible to no one but himself, that he was entirely his own master. He was engaged in his own private adventure, and had only himself to look to; and thus he enjoyed a great advantage over a commissioned officer with his work marked out beforehand, and the feeling that he is accountable to higher powers for every step he takes, and is liable to be recalled for any misconstruction that may be put upon his actions. A man under such circumstances is always apt to be too anxious for active measures, even when his own consciousness would tell him that the desired end might be effected more surely, by letting things work out their own course under the gentle but sure influence of the moral power and resolute will well known to belong to his cause. The only way to bring out the powers of a man, is to place confidence in him to perform his appointed task. It is the sign of a great statesman, or a great leader in any cause, to show discrimination in his choice of agents, but having chosen them, to give them free scope for their talents: it is an inferior mind which prefers to have a band of humble instruments, over whom he may exercise a constant and irritating supervision. The latter system may often appear most business-like and most politic, indeed it is the principle of modern times; but the former, as it requires a higher mind for its centre—for we estimate an acute knowledge of character far higher than the most comprehensive powers of circumspection—so it is the policy of the more enlightened and disinterested exercise of authority. The only difficulty is, when you have to deal with an inferior race of men whom you really cannot trust. But this applies not to Englishmen. All experience has taught us, and Mr. Brooke has, in the quiet times of peace, given us noble confirmation, that an English gentleman, of good education and natural intelligence, possesses innate powers of a high order, which only require their opportunity to come forth. With such a class to choose from, we think that those in authority are without excuse, if they prefer the inferior though sometimes necessary principle of reposing very limited confidence in their agents.

Those of our readers who are acquainted with Prescott's 'Conquest of Peru,' will find much in the character of Pedro de la Gasca, as there drawn, which is applicable to our present purpose. That distinguished ecclesiastic, in undertaking his mission to pacify the turbulent condition of the newly conquered empire of Peru, in the first place required that absolute power should be given him, even to blank papers impressed only with the royal sign manual. Thus armed, he felt that he could act as he thought best, without being harassed by continual instructions from the distant and excitable powers of his own country. His very first policy was such as would never have been acted on by one differently situated. He remained for months absolutely passive, as though he had crossed the Atlantic in vain; but he knew that his quiet influence was all the time preparing the way for a better state of things, more effectually than would immediate hostilities: he preferred patience to violence, and his reward was, that he most quickly arrived at the triumphant completion of his embassy, and was spared all the evils of a violent policy. Mr. Brooke was in so far a similar situation, that he was able to bide his own time, without fear of being recalled from any misconstruction of his actions, or without the temptation to gain favour at home by active measures and gallant exploits, ending only in self-display, when a quieter line would in the end be most efficacious. Prompt, resolute, and courageous when necessary, he yet preferred showing to the natives the more peaceful aspect of his national character: Would that, amid all the valiant achievements which have filled the annals of our country's foreign policy, there had been a greater proportion of peaceful victories! Many no doubt there have been, where our moral pre-eminence has taken the place of sword and bayonet; but those weapons of blood have been but too active, and where they have been used in any but the cause of just vengeance, we may boast indeed of a conquest over the bodies of men, but not over their hearts or souls.

For the benefit of those who may not be acquainted with the circumstances of Mr. Brooke's expedition, we will now, as much as possible in his own words, give an outline of that career which has brought him into notice. This outline shall be brief, for we hope afterwards to consider, as distinct topics, the passages of the book before us which refer to the physical nature of the island of Borneo, and also to the characters of its native inhabitants, especially as that may affect their ultimate conversion to Christianity.

In the year 1838, Mr. Brooke made a statement of his proposed object, which forms a most interesting appendix to Captain Keppel's book. The commencement of this we will extract here:—

> 'The voyage I made to China opened an entirely new scene, and showed me what I had never seen before, savage life and savage nature. I inquired, and I read, and I became more and more assured that there was a large field of discovery and adventure open to any man daring enough to enter

upon it. Just take a map and trace a line over the Indian Archipelago, with its thousand unknown islands and tribes. Cast your eye over the vast island of New Guinea, where the foot of European has scarcely, if ever, trod. Look at the northern coast of Australia, with its mysterious Gulf of Carpentaria; a survey of which it is supposed would solve the great geographical question respecting the rivers of the mimic continent. Place your finger on Japan, with its exclusive and civilised people; it lies an unknown lump on our earth, and an undefined line on our charts! Think of the northern coast of China, willing, as is reported, to open an intercourse and trade with Europeans, spite of their arbitrary government. Stretch your pencil over the Pacific Ocean, which Cook himself declares a field of discovery for ages to come! Proceed to the coast of South America, from the region of gold-dust to the region of furs—the land ravaged by the cruel Spaniard, and the no less cruel buccanier—the scene of the adventures of Drake and the descriptions of Dampier. The places I have enumerated are mere names, with no specific ideas attached to them: lands and seas where the boldest navigators gained a reputation, and where hundreds may yet do so, if they have the same courage and the same perseverance. Imagination whispers to Ambition, that there are yet lands unknown which might be discovered. Tell me, would not a man's life be well spent—tell me, would it not be well sacrificed, in an endeavour to explore these regions? When I think on dangers and death, I think on them only because they would remove me from such a field of ambition, for energy, and for knowledge.

'Borneo, Celebes, Sooloo, the Moluccas, and the islands of the Straits of Sunda and Banka, compose what is called the Malayan group; and the Malays located on the sea-shores of these and other islands may with certainty be classed as belonging to one people. It is well known, however, that the interior of these countries is inhabited by various tribes, differing from the Malays and each other, and presenting numerous gradations of early civilisation; the Dyaks of Borneo, the papuans of New Guinea, and others, besides the black race scattered over the islands. Objects of traffic here as elsewhere present interesting subjects of inquiry; and whilst our acquaintance with every other portion of the globe, from the passage of the Pole to the navigation of the Euphrates, has greatly extended, it is matter of surprise that we know scarcely anything of these people beyond the bare fact of their existence, and remain altogether ignorant of the geographical features of the countries they inhabit. Countries which present an extended field for Christianity and commerce, which none surpass in fertility, rich beyond the Americas in mineral productions, and unrivalled in natural beauty, continue unexplored to the present day; and, in spite of the advantages which would probably result, have failed to attract the attention they so well deserve. The difficulty of the undertaking will scarcely account for its non-performance, if we consider the voluntary sacrifices made on the shrine of African research, or the energy displayed and the sufferings encountered by the explorers of the polar regions; yet the necessity of prosecuting the voyage in an armed vessel, the wildness of the interior tribes, the lawless ferocity of the Malays, and other dangers, would prevent most individuals from fixing on this field for exertion, and points it out as one which could best and most fully be accomplished by Government or some influential body.'—Vol. i. pp. 367, &c.

The conclusion of the same document is also most interesting, especially when we know of his final success.

'I cannot but express my regret, that from pecuniary considerations as well as the small size of the vessel, and the limited quantity of provisions she carries, I am unable to take a naturalist and draughtsman; but I should always hail with pleasure any scientific person who joined me abroad, or who happened to be in the countries at the time; and I may venture to promise him every encouragement and facility in the prosecution of his pursuits. I embark upon the expedition with great cheerfulness, with a stout vessel, a good crew, and the ingredients of success as far as the limited scale of the undertaking will permit; and I cast myself upon the waters—like Mr. Southey's little book—but whether the world will know me after many days, is a question which, hoping the best, I cannot answer with any positive degree of assurance.'—Vol. i. p. 381.

Captain Keppel's sketch of Mr. Brooke's life previous to 1838 we also insert.

'But before illustrating these circumstances from his own journals, it may be acceptable to say a few words respecting the individual himself, and his extraordinary career. I am indebted to a mutual friend, acquainted with him from early years, for the following brief but interesting outline of his life; and have only to premise, that Mr. Brooke is the lineal representative of Sir Robert Vyner, Bart. and Lord Mayor of London in the reign of Charles II.: Sir Robert had but one child, a son, Sir George Vyner, who died childless, and his estate passed to his heir-at-law, Edith, his father's eldest sister, whose lineal descendant is our friend. Sir Robert was renowned for his loyalty to his sovereign, to whom he devoted his wealth, and to whose memory he raised a monument.

'" Mr. Brooke was the second, and is now the only surviving son of the late Thomas Brooke, Esq., of the civil service of the East India Company; was born on the 29th April, 1803; went out to India as a cadet, where he held advantageous situations, and distinguished himself by his gallantry in the Burmese war. He was shot through the body in an action with the Burmese, received the thanks of the government, and returned to England for the recovery of his prostrated strength. He resumed his station, but shortly afterwards relinquished the service, and in search of health and amusement left Calcutta for China in 1830. In this voyage, while going up the China seas, he saw for the first time the islands of the Asiatic Archipelago—islands of vast importance and unparalleled beauty—lying neglected and almost unknown. He inquired and read, and became convinced that Borneo and the Eastern Isles afforded an open field for enterprise and research. To carry to the Malay races, so long the terror of the European merchant vessel, the blessings of civilization, to suppress piracy and extirpate the slave-trade, became his humane and generous objects; and from that hour the energies of his powerful mind were devoted to this one pursuit. Often foiled, often disappointed, but animated with a perseverance and enthusiasm which defied all obstacle, he was not until 1838 enabled to set sail from England on his darling project. The intervening years had been devoted to preparation and inquiry; a year spent in the Medditerranean had tested his vessel, the 'Royalist,' and his crew; and so completely had he studied his subject, and calculated on contingencies, that the least sanguine of his friends felt as he left the shore, hazardous and unusual as the enterprise appeared to be, that he had omitted nothing to insure a successful issue. "I go," said he, "to awake the spirit of slumbering philanthropy with regard to these islands; to carry Sir Stamford Raffles' views in Java over the whole Archipelago. Fortune and life I give freely; and if I fail in the attempt, I shall not have lived wholly in vain."

'" In the admiration I feel for him I may farther be permitted to add, that if any man ever possessed in himself the resources and means by which such noble designs were to be achieved, that man was James Brooke! Of the most enlarged views; truthful and generous; quick to acquire and appreciate; excelling in every manly sport and exercise; elegant and accomplished; ever accessible; and above all, prompt and determined to redress injury and relieve misfortune,—he was of all others the best qualified to impress the native mind with the highest opinion of the English character. How he has succeeded, the influence he has acquired, and the benefits he has conferred, his own uncoloured narrative, contained in the following pages, best declares, and impresses on the world a lasting lesson of the good that attends individual enterprise, when well-directed, of which every Englishman may feel justly proud."

'Such is the sketch of Mr. Brooke by one well competent to judge of that to which he bears witness. In pursuance of the mission thus eloquently and truly described, that gentleman left his native shores in the year 1838, in his yacht the 'Royalist' schooner, of 142 tons, belonging to the Royal Yacht Squadron, with a crew of upwards of twenty men. His general views were distinct and certain; but the details into which they shaped themselves have been so entirely guided by unforeseen occurrences, that it is necessary to look to his first visit to Borneo for their explanation; and in order to do so, I must refer to his private journal, which he kindly confided to me, after I had in vain tried to persuade him to take upon himself the publication of its contents, so rich in new and interesting intelligence.'—Vol. i. pp. 2, &c.

Mr. Brooke's own journal thus describes the preparation necessary for his project.

'"I had for some years turned my mind to the geography of the Indian Archipelago, and cherished an ardent desire to become better acquainted with a country combining the richest natural productions with an unrivalled degree of luxuriant beauty. Circumstances for a time prevented my entering on this field for enterprise and research; and when the barriers were removed, I had many preparations to make and some difficulties to overcome.

'"In an expedition conducted by government, the line of discipline is so distinctly understood, and its infringement so strictly punished, that small hazard is incurred of any inconvenience arising from such a source. With an individual, however, there is no such assurance, for he cannot appeal to the articles of war; and the ordinary legal enactments for the protection of the mariner will not enable him to effect objects so far removed beyond the scope of the laws. I was fully aware that many would go, but that few might stay; for whilst a voyage of discovery *in prospectu* possesses great attractions for the imagination, the hardship, danger, and the thousand other rude realities, soon dissipate the illusion, and leave the aspirant longing for that home he should never have quitted. In like manner, seamen can be procured in abundance, but cannot be kept from desertion whenever any matter goes wrong; and the total previous ignorance of their characters and dispositions renders this more likely, as the admission of one "black sheep" goes far to taint the entire crew.

'"These considerations fully convinced me that it was necessary to form *men* to my purpose, and by a line of steady and kind conduct, to raise up a personal regard for myself and attachment for the vessel, which could not be expected in ordinary cases. In pursuance of this object, I was nearly three years in preparing a crew to my mind, and gradually moulding them to consider the hardest fate or misfortune under my command as better than the ordinary service in a merchant-vessel. How far I have succeeded, remains yet to be proved; but I cannot help hoping that I have raised the character of many, and have rendered all happy and contented since they have been with me; and certain am I that no men can do their duty more cheerfully or willingly than the crew of the 'Royalist.'

'"I may pass over in silence, my motives for undertaking so long and arduous a voyage; and it will be sufficient to say, that I have been firmly convinced of its beneficial tendency in adding to knowledge, increasing trade, and spreading Christianity. The prospectus of the undertaking was published in the *Geographical Journal*, vol. viii. part iii. of 1838, when my preparations for sea were nearly complete. I had previously avoided making any public mention of my intentions, for praise before performance is disgusting; and I knew that I should be exposed to prying curiosity, desirous of knowing what I did not know myself.'—Vol. i. pp. 5, &c.

On the 16th of December, 1838, the 'Royalist' finally quitted England, and on the first of June in the following year, the adventurous party reached Singapore, which port formed their head-quarters for subsequent refittings, and for communication with Europe. On the 1st of August they anchored off Borneo, but this year they remained but a few months, during which time Mr. Brooke made many interesting exploring expeditions, and formed an acquaintance with Muda Hassim, the Rajah of Sarawak, who is afterwards most prominent in the history. He then returned to Singapore, and his next voyage was devoted to the islands of the Celebes. That expedition, and also ill-health, prevented his again visiting Sarawak till the end of August 1840. From this time began the extraordinary part of his career. Instead of only exploring the country, he now became immersed in its politics. Muda Hassim enlisted him on his side against an army of rebels in the interior, and by a long course of events, in all which the virtues we have ascribed to him are most conspicuous, he at length received the appointment of Rajah of Sarawak in September 1841, Muda Hassim giving up his position—having only undertaken it during the civil war—with the intention of returning to Borneo Proper, of which his uncle was the sultan. Once in power, his influence increased most rapidly; he established courts of justice, in which he arbitrated between the oppressive Malays and their Dyak dependents in a manner that astonished the former, and made the latter look on him as their friend. He then directed his attention to the establishment of commercial intercourse between Borneo and Europe, and as a first step, he waged desperate war with the swarms of pirates that have for ages infested the whole coast. This would appear to have been the occupation of whole tribes, whose cruelties and depredations put an entire stop to all improvement in the general state of the island. For this purpose he received assistance from several of H. M. Ships, and in company with Captain Keppel of the 'Dido,' he had many a sharp encounter, before the haunts where these lawless wretches protected themselves in most formidable array could be broken up. In 1845 Mr. Brooke was appointed Her Majesty's agent in Borneo, and sailed for Borneo Proper (the chief town of the island), where, after strengthening his position with the local authorities, a work of no little difficulty and patience, he examined the island of Labuan with a view to its becoming a British station, a design which was afterwards realized. He then went back to Sarawak, and from thence, as our readers are aware, he has returned to his native shores, not to repose in honours already won, but to increase his means of future usefulness. May he not be disappointed! may the reception he has met with at home enable him to establish his own position with honour and security, as well as the commercial interests of both countries with mutual profit! and, more than all, may the Christian mission he has been the means of sending be productive of a mighty revolution in the whole condition of the native inhabitants!

It is time now that we discuss the natural features of the island, but as the direct mention of these is brought in chiefly with reference to commerce, it is only incidentally that we come across descriptions of scenery. Mr. Brooke's journal differs materially from the journal of a mere traveller, for his thoughts were too much taken up with the business he was always engaged in, to allow him very often to enlarge on mere objects of beauty, though we have ample testimony throughout that such things were fully appreciated by him. The following passage presents an agreeable scene.

> 'We left our boats near its entrance, and walked to the small but steep mountain, Tubbang. Its length may be about 400 feet. After mounting by a winding path, about half-way up towards the top, we arrived at the entrance of a cave, into which we descended through a hole. It is fifty or sixty feet long, and the far end is supported on a colonnade of stalactites, and opens on a sheer precipice of 100 or 150 feet. Hence the spectator can overlook the distant scene; the forest lies at his feet, and only a few trees growing from the rock reach nearly to the level of the grotto. The effect is striking and panoramic; the grotto cheerful; floored with fine sand; the roof groined like Gothic, whence the few clear drops which filter through, form here and there the fantastic stalactites common to such localities. The natives report the cave to be the residence of a fairy queen; and they show her bed, pillow, and other of her household furniture. Within the cave we found a few remnants of human bones; probably some poor Dyak who had crawled there to die.'—Vol. i. p. 202.

The province of Sarawak, which we may take as a sample of the whole island, is thus described:—

> 'It is bounded to the westward by the Sambas territory, to the southward by a range of mountains which separate it from the Pontiana river, and to the eastward by the Borneon territory of Sadong. Within this space there are several rivers and islands, which it is needless here to describe at length, as the account of the river of Sarawak will answer alike for the rest. There are two navigable entrances to this river, and numerous smaller branches for boats, both to the westward and eastward; the two principal entrances combine at about twelve miles from the sea, and the river flows for twenty miles into the interior in a southerly and westerly

direction, when it again forms two branches—one running to the right, the other to the left hand, as far as the mountain range. Besides these facilities for water communication, there exist three other branches from the easternmost entrance, called Morotaba, one of which joins the Samarahan river, and the two others flow from different points of the mountain range already mentioned. The country is diversified by detached mountains, and the mountain range has an elevation of about 3,000 feet. The aspect of the country may be generally described as low and woody at the entrance of the rivers, except a few high mountains; but in the interior, undulating in parts, and part presenting fine level plains. The climate may be pronounced healthy and cool, though in the six months from September to March a great quantity of rain falls. During my three visits to this place, which have been prolonged to eight months, and since residing here, we have been clear of sickness, and during the entire period not one of three deaths could be attributed to the effects of climate. The more serious maladies of tropical climates are very infrequent; from fever and dysentery we have been quite free, and the only complaints have been rheumatism, colds, and ague; the latter, however, attacked us in the interior, and no one has yet had it at Sarawak, which is situated about twenty-five miles from the mouth of the river.

'The soil and productions of this country are of the richest description; and it is not too much to say, that, within the same given space, there are not to be found the same mineral and vegetable riches in any land in the world. I propose to give a brief detail of them, beginning with the soil of the plains, which is moist and rich, and calculated for the growth of rice, for which purpose it was formerly cleared and used, until the distractions of the country commenced. From the known industry of the Dyaks, and their partiality to rice-cultivation, there can be little doubt that it would become an article of extensive export, provided security were given to the cultivator, and a proper remuneration for his produce. The lower grounds, besides rice, are well adapted for the growth of sago, and produce canes, rattans, and forest timber of the finest description for ship-building and other useful purposes. The Chinese export considerable quantities of timber from Sambas and Pontiana, particularly of the kind called Balean by the natives, or the lion wood of the Europeans; and at this place it is to be had in far greater quantity and nearer the place of sale. The undulating ground differs in soil, some portions of it being a yellowish clay, whilst the rest is a rich mould; these grounds, generally speaking, as well as the slopes of the higher mountains, are admirably calculated for the growth of nutmegs, coffee, pepper, or any of the more valuable vegetable productions of the tropics. Besides the above-mentioned articles, there are birds'-nests, bees'-wax, and several kinds of scented wood, in demand at Singapore, which are all collected by the Dyaks, and would be gathered in far greater quantity provided the Dyak was allowed to sell them.

'Turning from the vegetable to the mineral riches of the country, we have diamonds, gold, tin, iron, and antimony-ore certain; I have lately sent what I believe to be a specimen of lead-ore to Calcutta; and copper is reported. It must be remembered, in reading this list, that the country is as yet unexplored by a scientific person, and that the inquiries of a geologist and a mineralogist would throw further light on the minerals of the mountains, and the spots where they are to be found in the greatest plenty. The diamonds are stated to be found in considerable numbers, and of a good water; and I judge the statement to be correct from the fact that the diamond-workers from Sandak come here and work secretly, and the people from Banjarmasim, who are likewise clever at this trade, are most desirous to be allowed to work for the precious stone. Gold of a good quality certainly is to be found in large quantities. The eagerness and perseverance of the

Chinese to establish themselves is a convincing proof of the fact; and ten years since a body of about 3000 of them had great success in procuring gold by their ordinary mode of trenching the ground.—Vol. ii. pp. 188, &c.

In the island of Labuan, and on the mainland near Borneo Proper, there is also abundance of excellent coal and ironstone, which will be greater inducements to English commerce, and English steam navigation, than even gold or diamonds. It would be no slight assistance to our communication with China to have a regular supply of coal constantly waiting half way between India and Canton. The following extract will explain this advantage.

'It will be seen by the map, that Borneo is, of all the great islands of the western portion of the Archipelago, the nearest to China, and Labuan and its neighbourhood the nearest point of this island. The distance of Hong Kong is about 1000 miles, and that of the island of Hainan, a great place for emigration, not above 800; distances which to the Chinese junks—fast sailers before the strong and favourable winds of the monsoon—do not make voyages exceeding four or five days. The coasts of the provinces of Canton and Fokien have hitherto been the great hives from which Chinese emigration has proceeded; and even Fokien is not above 1400 miles from Labuan, a voyage of seven or eight days. Chinese trade and immigration will come together. The north-west coast of Borneo produces an unusual supply of those raw articles for which there is always a demand in the markets of China; and Labuan, it may be reckoned upon with certainty, will soon become the seat of a larger trade with China than the river of Borneo ever possessed.

'I by no means anticipate the same amount of rapid advance in population, commerce, or financial resources for Labuan, that has distinguished Singapore, a far more centrical position for general commerce; still I think its prospect of success undoubted; while it will have some advantages which Singapore cannot, from its nature, possess. Its coal-mines, and the command of the coal-fields on the river of Borneo, are the most remarkable of these; and its superiority as a post-office station necessarily follows. Then it is far more convenient as a port of refuge; and, as far as our present knowledge will enable us to judge, infinitely more valuable for military purposes, more especially for affording protection to the commerce which passes through the Chinese Sea, amounting at present to probably not less than 300,000 tons of shipping, carrying cargoes certainly not under the value of 15,000,000*l.* sterling.'—Vol. ii. pp. 222, &c.

We will extract a few remarks on this subject from an appendix to our present work, entitled a 'Sketch of Borneo,' by J. Hunt, Esq., communicated to Sir Stamford Raffles in 1812.

'This country is by no means so warm as one would be led to imagine by its proximity everywhere to the line: this arises from the perpetual refreshing showers and the land and sea breezes, the former being wafted over innumerable rivers. In the month of November, the thermometer at Pontiana ranges from 78° to 82°.

'During the wet season, the rivers swell and overflow the adjacent shores, and run down with such continued rapidity, that the water may be tasted fresh at sea at the distance of six or seven miles from the mouths: these overflowings fertilise the banks and the adjacent country, and render the shores of Borneo, like the plains of Egypt, luxuriantly rich. Susceptible of the highest possible culture, particularly in wet grain, in the dry season, the coasts, from these overflowings, present to the eye the richest enamelled fields of full-grown grass for miles around. It is at this season that whole herds of wild cattle range down from the mountains in the interior to fatten on the plains; but during the wet season they ascend to their hills.

'The whole of the north, the north-west, and the centre of Borneo is extremely mountainous. The greatest portion of the ancient kingdom of Borneo Proper is extremely elevated. That of Kiney Baulu, or St. Peter's Mount, in latitude 6° north, is perhaps one of the highest mountains known. The country about Sambas, Pontiana, and Sukadana is occasionally interspersed with a few ranges of hills, otherwise the land here might be deemed low. But to the southward, and more particularly to the east, in the Straits of Macassar, it is very low. The shore in these latter places is extremely moist and swampy; but the interior is said to be dry.'—Vol. i. p. 394.

An unfortunate event accompanied the first taking possession of Labuan, which did not augur well for its healthiness; but Mr. Brooke thus accounts for it:—

'The gratification we feel in recording an event of such high promise in the history of commerce and civilisation is impaired by one unhappy circumstance. The officers and crews of the two vessels suffered severely from sickness at Labuan; and Messrs. Gordon and Airey, the commander of the Wolf and the master of the Iris, fell victims to the jungle-fever. The former dying on the island, was buried there; the latter expired a few days after his return to Singapore. The sickness that prevailed among the sailors has been ascribed to their imprudent indulgence in the wild fruits of the island, to over-exertion, and needless exposure, &c. These things may have done some hurt; but the main cause of the sickness is too obvious to be mistaken. The ceremony of hoisting the flag was performed on a large space, cleared of jungle, and levelled expressly for that purpose. It is very strange that the officers engaged in the service should not have been aware of the infallible consequences of such a proceeding. In all tropical climates, deadly miasmata continue for a long while to hang over newly-made surfaces of earth, and malignant fevers surely await the white men who are rash enough to take up their abode on such spots before they have been sufficiently exposed to wind and sun.

'There is nothing, therefore, in the unfortunate incidents that have marked our taking possession of Labuan which should warrant a belief in the insalubrity of the island. Probably there is no spot within the tropics where European life is exposed to fewer risks from natural causes. The soil of the island is light and porous; it contains few or no morasses; and its situation exposes it to the action of the prevailing winds, which sweep perpetually up and down those seas. For nine months of the year it is supplied abundantly with water; and if during the other three months this article of primary necessity be less plentiful, it is still in no worse a predicament than Singapore itself. On the north of the island there are several small runnels which would appear to be supplied by perennial sources; and it will everywhere be easy to construct tanks and reservoirs.'—Vol. ii. pp. 260, &c.

From the physical constitution of Borneo, we will now turn to its inhabitants; and on this point we have Mr. Brooke's valuable opinion on various classes of his subjects before his prejudices were likely to be enlisted in their behalf in consequence of the position of authority he now holds over them. It is on this account, perhaps, almost ungenerous to bring his own words against his territories, which were spoken under such different circumstances—as if our object were to put him out of conceit with his newly acquired subjects. Mr. Brooke is not now a mere traveller, free to say what he likes of the natives around him, but the fatherly links of his rajahship no doubt enchain his heart with a moiety of the obverse of that principle that the king can do no wrong. However this may be, or whatever are his present feelings towards the inhabitants of Borneo, how far he identifies himself with them, and whether in the act of holding a levee in his character of Rajah of Sarawak and the independent chiefs of Borneo, as he has done at Oxford, he at all forgot that he was an Englishman, and had not always been a component part of a state in the Eastern Archipelago; yet it is most certain that his dealings with the island, and his peculiar talents for engaging the sympathies of all who come in his way, have thrown very great light on characters, and on conditions of life, about which little has hitherto been known. It would be in vain to expect that any extracts from his journal could in a reasonable space give much of the information he has gathered together, or give our readers the benefit of his reflections and sentiments. The whole compilation which Captain Keppel has published is most interesting and useful. The journal is well arranged, and the captain's own part is straightforward and well written, though strongly tinctured with the spirit of his profession. It is clear that the fighting part was more to his taste than the silent conferences with Malay authorities at which he had to be present. When on shore, he does not appear so much absorbed in the interest of native politics as his companion, and he has an inclination to diverge towards the more congenial subject of the prospect Borneo holds out to the future sportsman who may roam over its hills. This, however, is but incidental, and throughout his work it is impossible not to admire his high spirit, great good-nature, and the hearty admiration he uniformly manifests towards Mr. Brooke's character and intentions, as well as the ready co-operation he at all times gave him.

The inhabitants of the island of Borneo consist of three distinct races: the aborigines, commonly called Dyaks; the Malays, who are the conquerors of these people, and hold them in oppressive subjection; and lastly, the Chinese emigrants, of whom there are vast numbers. The latter are a useful body in all laborious pursuits, but as they do not enter much into the political relations of the country, we have little to do with them.

The two former are the people with whom Mr. Brooke had to deal.

The term Dyak properly applies to but one tribe of the original inhabitants, but for convenience, sake it is used as a generic term. Concerning their origin there is great doubt; that there was in time gone by a distinct Polynesian race appears certain; it is also most probable that this race was of different origin from the Asiatic nations. Mr. Brooke in one place suggests the idea that these islands were peopled originally by a tide of emigration from east to west; but after more investigation, he is satisfied with calling them aborigines, leaving it rather to be inferred that there was not that radical difference between them and the Malays as had been supposed; but that the latter invaded these islands at a later period, and were therefore much more civilized. We will not, however, enter into such a wide discussion, but confine ourselves to the present state in which they are found. This is peculiar: they are not exactly savage, yet they are far from being civilized. In many respects they have tolerable notions of the comforts and conveniences of life, yet in others they are morally depraved to an extent which excludes them from any right to the name of civilization in any stage of growth. But their character is not without hope, as is the case with some barbarous people. Their savage practices are in a great measure attributable to the fearful anarchy, misrule and oppression under which they suffer. It is hopeless for them, subject as they are to the grossest imposition and most constant depredations—nay, even habitual slaughter—to improve their condition. Mr. Brooke's sympathies have been most nobly excited in their behalf; the protection of these unfortunate, and, naturally, mild and gentle people, has ever been the chief incentive in his arduous task. Under his kind and thoughtful management we see no reason why they should not at once rise into the state of a useful and profitable people. They are, indeed, more than usually wanting in any form of religion, and this is one cause, no doubt, why they have not maintained themselves in greater independence; but the deficiency, we hope, will soon be changed into a very different aspect of affairs through the labours of those who are now setting out on their Christian mission.

The Malays are a different race; they approach nearer to our conceptions of the Asiatic character, and in their disposition form a great contrast both with Europeans and with uncivilized nations. They differ from the former not so much as being in another stage of civilization—for in many respects they are a most highly sensitive and polite people—but as being unconscious of that idea of morals which constitutes our code of honour and propriety. All their notions of good and evil appear to find no parallel in our conceptions of truth. This partly arises from their very blood, and partly from the religion of Mahomet. Perhaps it is not too much to say that the religion of Mahomet was a political device to satisfy the peculiar moral deficiency which has ever existed in the Asiatic character, high-bred and courteous as it is. Be this as it may, the want we speak of is most apparent in the character of the Borneo Malays. They have no conception of any restraint but absolute and immediate fear. They have no honesty, no honour, no idea of truth, and no principle by which they can keep their hands from all manner of crime if they can do it with impunity. It thus follows that those in power are extortionate and oppressive, while those in subjection, being under the constant restraint of fear, show indeed more of the virtues of their race, but only from the same principle which makes one cock in a farm-yard look of an amiable disposition, whilst he is being continually thrashed by a stronger power. Remove the bigger cock, and the mildness of the other will soon vanish. The extraordinary deceitfulness and cowardice of character we find so often mentioned in the Psalms and other parts of Scripture would appear to have the Eastern stamp vividly marked; not but that human nature is the same in all; but a certain aspect of the mind, or a certain moral deficiency, may be peculiarly prominent in distinct races of the human family. Thus, there certainly is a want of the virtue understood by the term generosity, in the Eastern character. There is a disposition to exert power according to ability, not according to right; to oppress others whenever there is the opportunity; in short, to act up to the animal instinct which is observed in our former illustration from a farm-yard. On this principle, the man who is able appropriates many wives, though conscious of the laws of nature which divide the human race about equally into male and female. Again, regal authority becomes personal despotism, and every relation of life which places one in a position physically inferior to another is made the occasion of oppression and cruelty. The whole Asiatic character is represented by the fatalist's wheel of fortune. As Heaven places one up on high and another down below, they see no reason why its decrees should be opposed; they rather make it their religion to use such exaltation with all its physical force, and flatter themselves that when they are gratifying their own evil passions they are but acting in accordance with the Divine will, which has given them the opportunity of doing so. This earth appears to such a mind as a paradise into which the tempter has not intruded; for it is a place where every impulse is supposed to be good, and no idea of an inward struggle between good and bad is taken into account. Absolute and ferocious power is the consequence of such a system of belief, and it is also the only preservative of any human society under its influence. The relations which subsist between sin or misfortune and the human race in its present state, are not understood, and therefore their effects are either rejected with unsympathizing and cruel severity, or, if that cannot be done, are submitted to with the unprofitable resignation of the fatalist.

We now proceed to lay before our readers a series of extracts illustrative of the inhabitants of Borneo, and of Mr. Brooke's manner of dealing with them. After what we have already said, it will be unnecessary to make any but explanatory comments on them.

We begin with Mr. Brooke's first introduction to Sarāwak, and his description of Muda Hassim.

'15*th*.—Anchored abreast of Sarāwak at seven, and saluted the rajah with twenty-one guns, which were returned with eighteen from his residence. The rajah's own brother, Pangeran Mahammed, then saluted the vessel with seven guns, which were returned. Having breakfasted, and previously intimated our intention, we pulled ashore to visit the great man. He received us in state, seated in his hall of audience, which outside is nothing but a large shed erected on piles, but within decorated with taste. Chairs were placed on each side of the ruler, who occupied the head seat. Our party were placed on one hand; on the other sat his brother Mahammed, and Macota and some others of his principal chiefs; whilst immediately behind him his twelve younger brothers were seated.

'The dress of Muda Hassim was simple, but of rich material; and most of the principal men were well, and even superbly dressed. His countenance is plain, but intelligent and highly pleasing, and his manners perfectly elegant and easy. His reception was kind, and, I am given to understand, highly flattering. We sat, however, trammelled with the formality of state, and our conversation did not extend beyond kind inquiries and professions of friendship. We were presented with tobacco rolled up in a leaf, each about a foot long, and tea was served by attendants on their knees. A band played wild and not unmusical airs during the interview, and the crowd of attendants who surrounded us were seated in respectful silence. After a visit of half an hour, we rose and took our leave.'—Vol. i. pp. 28, &c.

The following extracts are descriptive of the Dyaks:—

'*September* 1*st*.—The river Lundu is of considerable breadth, about half a mile at the mouth, and 150 or 200 yards off Tungong. Tungong stands on the left hand (going up) close to the margin of the stream, and is enclosed by a slight stockade. Within this defence there is *one* enormous house for the whole population, and three or four small huts. The exterior of the defence between it and the river is occupied by sheds for prahus, and at each extremity are one or two houses belonging to Malay residents.

'The common habitation, as rude as it is enormous, measures 594 feet in length, and the front room, or *street*, is the entire length of the building, and twenty-one feet broad. The back part is divided by mat-partitions into the private apartments of the various families, and of these there are forty-five separate doors leading from the public apartment. The widowers and young unmarried men occupy the public room, as only those with wives are entitled to the advantage of separate rooms. The floor of this edifice is raised twelve feet from the ground, and the means of ascent is by the trunk of a tree with notches cut in it—a most difficult, steep, and awkward ladder. In front is a terrace fifty feet broad, running partially along the front of the building, formed, like the floors, of split bamboo. This platform, as well as the front room, besides the regular inhabitants, is the resort of pigs, dogs, birds, monkeys, and fowls, and presents a glorious scene of confusion and bustle. Here the ordinary occupations of domestic labour are carried on—padi ground, mats made, &c. &c. There were 200 men, women, and children counted in the room and in front whilst we were there in the middle of the day; and allowing for those abroad and those in their own rooms, the whole community cannot be reckoned at less than 400 souls. Overhead, about seven feet high, is a second crazy story, on which they stow their stores of food and their implements of labour and war. Along the large room are hung many cots, four feet long, formed of the hollowed trunks of trees cut in half, which answer the purpose of seats by day and beds by night. The Sibnowan Dyaks are a wild-looking but apparently quiet and inoffensive race. The apartment of their chief, by name Sejugah, is situated nearly in the centre of the building, and is larger than any other. In front of it nice mats were spread on the occasion of our visit, whilst over our heads dangled about thirty ghastly skulls, according to the custom of these people. The chief was a man of middle age, with a mild and pleasing countenance and gentle manners. He had around him several sons and relations, and one or two of the leading men of his tribe; but the rest seemed by no means to be restrained by his presence, or to show him any particular marks of respect—certainly nothing of the servile obsequiousness observed by the Malays before their prince. Their dress consists of a single strip of cloth round the loins, with the ends hanging down before and behind, and a light turban, composed of the bark of trees twined round the head, and so arranged that the front is stuck up somewhat resembling a short plume of feathers.

'Their figures are almost universally well-made, showing great activity without great muscular development; but their stature is diminutive, as will be seen by the following measurements, taken at random amongst them, and confirmed by general observation.'—Vol. i. pp. 51, &c.

'Like the rest of the Dyaks, the Sibnowans adorn their houses with the heads of their enemies; but with them this custom exists in a modified form; and I am led to hope, that the statements already made public of their reckless search after human beings, *merely* for the purpose of obtaining their heads, will be found to be exaggerated, if not untrue; and that the custom elsewhere, as here and at Lundu, will be found to be more accordant with our knowledge of other wild tribes, and to be regarded merely as a triumphant token of valour in the fight or ambush; similar, indeed, to the scalps of the North American Indian.

'Some thirty skulls were hanging from the roof of the apartment; and I was informed that they had many more in their possession; all, however, the heads of enemies, chiefly of the tribe of Sarebus. On inquiring, I was told, that it is indispensably necessary a young man should procure a skull before he gets married. When I urged on them, that the custom would be more honoured in the breach than in the observance, they replied, that it was established from time immemorial, and could not be dispensed with. Subsequently, however, Sejugah allowed that heads were very difficult to obtain now, and a young man might sometimes get married by giving presents to his ladye-love's parents. At all times they warmly denied ever obtaining any heads but those of their enemies; adding, they were bad people, and deserved to die.

'I asked a young unmarried man whether he would be obliged to get a head before he could obtain a wife. He replied, "Yes."—"When would he get one?" "Soon."—"Where would he go to get one?" "To the Sarebus river." I mention these particulars in detail, as I think, had their practice extended to taking the head of any defenceless traveller, or any Malay surprised in his dwelling or boat, I should have wormed the secret out of them.

'The men of this tribe marry but one wife, and that not until they have attained the age of seventeen or eighteen. Their wedding-ceremony is curious; and, as related, is performed by the bride and bridegroom being brought in procession along the large room, where a brace of fowls is placed over the bridegroom's neck, which he whirls seven times round his head. The fowls are then killed, and their blood sprinkled on the forehead of the pair, which done they are cooked, and eaten by the new-married couple *alone*, while the rest feast and drink during the whole night.

'Their dead are put in a coffin, and buried; but Sejugah informed me that the different tribes vary in this particular; and it would appear they differ from their near neighbours the Dyaks of Lundu.

'Like these neighbours, too, the Sibnowans seem to have little or no idea of a God. They offer prayers to Biedum, the great Dyak chief of former days. Priests and ceremonies they have none; the thickest mist of darkness is over them: but how much easier is it to dispel darkness with light, than to overcome the false blaze with the rays of truth!'—Vol. i. pp. 55, &c.

'The labour of the house, and all the drudgery, falls on the females. They grind the rice, carry burdens, fetch water, fish, and work in the fields; but though on a par with other savages in this respect, they have many advantages. They are not immured; they eat in company with the males; and, in most points, hold the same position towards their husbands and children as European women. The children are entirely naked; and the only peculiarity I observed is filing their teeth to a sharp point like those of a shark. The men marry but one wife, as I have before observed. Concubinage is unknown; and cases of seduction or adultery very seldom arise. Even the Malays speak highly of the chastity of the Dyak women; yet they are by no means shy under the gaze of strangers, and used to bathe before us in a state of nudity.

'That these Dyaks are in a low condition there is no doubt; but comparatively theirs is an innocent state, and I consider them capable of being easily raised in the scale of society. The absence of all prejudice regarding diet, the simplicity of their characters, the purity of their morals, and their present ignorance of all forms of worship and all idea of future responsibility, render them open to conviction of truth and religious impression. Yet when I say this, I mean, of course, only when their minds shall have been raised by education; for without previous culture, I reckon the labours of the missionary as useless as endeavouring to read off a blank paper. I doubt not but the Sibnowan Dyaks would readily receive missionary families amongst them, provided the consent of the Rajah Muda Hassim was previously obtained. That the rajah would consent, I much doubt; but if any person chose to reside at Tungong for the charitable purpose of leading the tribe gradually, by means of education, to the threshold of Christianity, it would be worth the asking, and I would exert what influence I possess with him on the occasion. I feel sure a missionary would be safe amongst them as long as he strictly confined himself to the gentle precepts and practice of his faith; he would live abundantly and cheaply, and be exposed to no danger except from the incursion of hostile tribes, which must always be looked for by a sojourner amid a Dyak community.'—Vol. i. pp. 59, &c.

'The musical instruments were the tomtom, or drum, and the Malayan gong; which were beat either slow or fast, according to the measure of the dance. The dances are highly interesting, more especially from their close resemblance, if not identity, with those of the South Sea Islanders. Two swords were placed on the mat, and two men commenced slowly from the opposite extremities, turning the body, extending the arms, and lifting the legs, in grotesque but not ungraceful attitudes. Approaching thus leisurely round and round about, they at length seize the swords, the music plays a brisker measure, and the dancers pass and repass each other, now cutting, now crossing swords, retiring and advancing; one kneeling as though to defend himself from the assaults of his adversary, at times stealthily waiting for an advantage, and quickly availing himself of it. The measure throughout was admirably kept, and the frequent turns were simultaneously made by both dancers, accompanied by the same eccentric gestures. The effect of all this far surpasses the impression to be made by a meagre description. The room partially lighted by damar torches—the clang of the noisy instruments—the crowd of wild spectators—their screams of encouragement to the performers—the flowing hair and rapid evolutions of the dancers, formed a scene I wish could have been reduced to painting by such a master as Rembrandt or Caravaggio.'—Vol. i. pp. 63, &c.

'The Dyaks, as is well known, are famous for the manufacture of iron. The forge here is of the simplest construction, and formed by two hollow trees, each about seven feet high, placed upright, side by side, in the ground; from the lower extremity of these, two pipes of bamboo are led through a clay-bank, three inches thick, into a charcoal-fire; a man is perched at the top of the trees, and pumps with two pistons (the suckers of which are made of cocks' feathers), which being raised and depressed alternately, blow a regular stream of air into the fire. Drawings were taken of these, and other utensils and instruments.'—Vol. i. pp. 65, &c.

We now give a few warlike scenes at which Mr. Brooke was present in assisting Muda Hassim against the rebels of the interior. We trust that, under his government, the 'grand army' of Sarāwak will be more valiant than heretofore.

'The Borneons, in fighting, wear a quilted jacket or spencer, which reaches over the hips, and from its size has a most unservicelike appearance: the bare legs and arms sticking out from under this puffed-out coat, like the sticks which support the garments of a scarecrow. Such was our incongruous and most inefficient army; yet with 300 men who would fight, nothing would have been easier than to take the detached defences of the enemy, none of which could contain above thirty or forty men. But our allies seemed to have little idea of fighting except behind a wall; and my proposal to attack the adversary was immediately treated as an extreme of rashness amounting to insanity. At a council of war it was consequently decided that advances should be made from the hill behind our fort to Balidah, by a chain of posts, the distance being a short mile, in which space they would probably erect four or five forts; and then would come a bombardment, noisy but harmless.

'During the day we were not left quiet. The beating of gongs, shouts, and an occasional shot, gave life to the scene. With my glass I could espy our forces at the top of the hill, pleased no doubt to see us coming to their support. At night loud shouts and firing from the rebels caused us to prepare for an attack; but it proved to be nothing but lights moving about the hill-side, with what intent we were ignorant. The jungle on the left bank having been cleared, we did not much expect any skirmishers; but some spies were heard near our boats. With this exception the night passed away unbroken on our part, though the rebels kept up an incessant beating of gongs, and from time to time fired a few stray shots, whether against an enemy or not was doubtful.

'*25th.*—The grand army was lazy, and did not take the field when they possessed themselves of two eminences, and commenced forts on each. About eleven A.M. we got intelligence that the enemy was collecting on the right bank, as they had been heard by our scouts shouting one to another to gather together in order to attack the stockades in the course of building. Even with a knowledge of their usual want of caution, I could not believe this, but walked nevertheless to one of the forts, and had scarcely reached it when a universal rebel shout, and a simultaneous beating of the silver-tongued gongs, announced, as I thought, a general action. But though the shouts continued loud and furious from both sides, and a gun or two was discharged in air to refresh their courage, the enemy did not attack, and a heavy shower damped the ardour of the approaching armies, and reduced all to inaction. Like the heroes of old, however, the adverse parties spoke to each other: "We are coming, we are coming," exclaimed the rebels; "lay aside your muskets, and fight us with swords." "Come on," was the reply; "we are building a stockade, and want to fight you." And so the heroes ceased not to talk, but forgot to fight, except that the rebels opened a fire from Balidah from swivels, all of which went over the tops of the trees. Peace, or rather rest, being restored, our party succeeded in entrenching themselves, and thus gained a field which had been obstinately assaulted by big words and loud cries. The distance of one fort from Balidah was about 800 yards, and manned with sixty Malays; whilst a party of Chinese garrisoned the other. Evening fell upon this innocent warfare. The Borneons, in this manner, contend with vociferous shouts; and, preceding each shout, the leader of the party offers up a prayer aloud to the Almighty, the chorus (or properly response) being the acclamation of the soldiery. We, on our side, kept up a firing and hallooing till midnight, to disguise the advance of a party who were to seize and build a stockade within a shorter distance of Balidah. When they reached the spot, however, the night being dark, the troops sleepy, and the leaders of different opinions, they returned without effecting any thing.'—Vol. i. pp. 156, &c.

'*26th.*—I must here pause in my account of this extraordinary and novel contest, briefly to describe the general appearance of the country.

'It is one delightful to look upon, combining all the requisites of the picturesque, viz., wood, water, mountain, cliff, and a foreground gently undulating, partially cultivated, and of the richest soil. The mountain of Sarambo, about 3000 feet in height, is the principal feature in the scene, situated at a short distance from the left bank of the river. The remainder of the ground slopes gradually; and the town of Siniawan, likewise on the left bank, is close to the water, and at the foot of the eminence called Gunga Kumiel.

'The advance of the party last night was, as I have said, disguised by firing, drumming, and shouting from the fleet and forts; and, in the deep stillness of the fine night, the booming of the guns, the clamour of the gongs, and the outcries raised from time to time, came on our ears like the spirit of discord breaking loose on a fair and peaceful paradise. About one o'clock the noises died away, and I enjoyed as quiet a slumber till daylight as though pillowed on a bed of down in the heart of Old England. About six I visited the three forts. The Chinese, Malays, and Dyaks were taking their morning meal, consisting of half a cocoa-nut-shell full of boiled rice with salt. The Dyaks were served in tribes; for as many of them are at war, it is necessary to keep them separate; and though they will not fight the enemy, they would have no objection to fall out with one another, and the slightest cause might give rise to an instant renewal of hostilities.'—Vol. i. pp. 160, &c.

A most favourable opportunity at length occurred for a spirited assault, but any dashing style of warfare never seems to have been consistent with their notions of discretion.

'The enemy dared not show themselves for the fire of the grape and canister, and nothing could have been easier; but my proposition caused a commotion which it is difficult to forget, and more difficult to describe. The Chinese consented, and Macota, the commander-in-chief, was willing; but his inferiors were backward, and there arose a scene which showed me the full violence of the Malay passions, and their infuriated madness when once roused. Pangeran Houseman urged with energy the advantage of the proposal, and in the course of a speech lashed himself to a state of fury; he jumped to his feet, and with demoniac gestures stamped round and round, dancing a war-dance after the most approved fashion; his countenance grew livid, his eyes glared, his features inflamed; and, for my part, not being able to interpret the torrent of his oratory, I thought the man possessed of a devil, or about to "run a-muck." But after a minute or two of this dance, he resumed his seat, furious and panting, but silent. In reply, Subtu urged some objections to my plan, which was warmly supported by Illudeen, who apparently hurt Subtu's feelings; for the indolent, the placid Subtu leapt from his seat, seized his spear, and rushed to the entrance of the stockade, with his passions and his pride desperately aroused. I never saw finer action than when, with spear in hand, pointing to the enemy's fort, he challenged any one to rush on with him. Houseman and Surradeen (the bravest of the brave) like madmen seized their swords to inflame the courage of the rest—it was a scene of fiends—but in vain; for though they appeared ready enough to quarrel and fight amongst themselves, there was no move to attack the enemy. All was confusion; the demon of discord and madness was amongst them, and I was glad to see them cool down, when the dissentients to the assault proposed making a round to-night and attacking to-morrow. In the mean time our six-pounders were ready in battery, and it is certain the assailants might walk nearly to the fort without any of the rebels daring to show themselves in opposition to our fire.

'*Nov.* 1*st.*—The guns were ready to open their fiery mouths, and their masters ready to attend on them; but both had to wait till mid-day, when the chiefs of the grand army, having sufficiently slept, breakfasted, and bathed, lounged up with their straggling followers. Shortly after daylight the forts are nearly deserted of their garrisons, who go down at the time to the water more like a flock of geese than warriors. The instant the main division and head quarters of the army arrived at the battery, I renewed my proposal for an assault, which was variously received. If the Malays would go, the Chinese agreed; but the Malays had grown colder and colder. In order to encourage them, I opened a fire to show the effect of our guns; and having got a good range, every ball, as well as grape and canister, rattled against and through the wood. I then urged them again and again, but in vain; that coward Panglima Rajah displayed that dogged resolution which is invincible—an invincible resolution to do nothing; and the cold damp looks of the others at once told the amount of their bravery! A council of war was called—grave faces covered timid hearts and fainting spirits. The Chinese contended, with justice, that in fairness they could not be expected to assault unless the Malays did the same; Abong Mia was not brave enough. The Datu agreed, and Panglima delivered himself of a wise harangue, to the effect that, "the last campaign, when they had a fort, how had the enemy fired then?—stabbed them, speared them, &c. &c.; and without a fort, assaulting!—how could it be expected they should succeed? how unreasonable they should go at all!" But even his stolid head seemed to comprehend the sarcasm when I asked him how many men had been killed during all this severe fighting? However, it was clear that it was no battle. We were all very savage, and I intimated how useless my being with them was, if they intended to play instead of fight. "What," I asked, "if you will not attack, are you going to do?" Oh, the wise counsels of these wise heads! Abong Mia proposed erecting a fort in a tree, and thence going "puff, puff," down into Balidah, accompanying the words "puff, puff," with expressive gestures of firing; but it was objected, that trees were scarce, and the enemy might cut down the tree, fort and all.'—Vol. i. p. 166, &c.

A striking feature in the state of the island has been said to be the oppressive and cruel treatment of the Dyaks by the Malays. A few extracts with reference to this subject will be convincing of the truth of this charge. The first is the story of Si Tundo.

'Si Tundo fell in love with a woman belonging to an adopted son of Macota; and the passion being mutual, the lady eloped from her master, and went to her lover's house. This being discovered in a short time, he was ordered to surrender her to Macota, which he reluctantly did, on an understanding that he was to be allowed to marry her on giving a proper dowry. Either not being able to procure the money, or the terms not being kept, Si Tundo and a relation (who had left the pirate fleet and resided with him) mounted to Macota's hill, and threatened to take the woman and to burn the house. The village, however, being roused, they were unable to effect their purpose, and retired to their own residence. Here they remained for some days in a state of incessant watchfulness, and when they moved, they each carrried their kempilan, and wore the krisses ready to the hand. The Rajah Muda Hassim, being well aware of the state of things, sent at this crisis to order Si Tundo and his friend to his presence; which order they obeyed forthwith, and entered the balei, or audience-hall, which was full of their enemies. According to Muda Hassim's account, he was anxious to save Si Tundo's life, and offered him another wife; but his affections being fixed on the girl of his own choice, he rejected the offer, only praying he might have the woman he loved. On entering the presence of the rajah, surrounded by foes, and dreading treachery (which most probably was intended), these unfortunate men added to their previous fault by one which, however slight in European estimation, is here of an aggravated nature,—they entered the presence with their kempilans in their hands, and their sarongs clear of the kris-handle; and instead of seating themselves cross-legged, they only squatted on their hams, ready for self-defence. From that hour their doom was resolved on: the crime of disrespect was deemed worthy of death, though their previous crime of abduction and violence might have obtained pardon. It was no easy matter, however, among an abject and timid population, to find executioners of the sentence against two brave and warlike men, well armed and watchful, and who, it was well known, would sell their lives dearly; and the subsequent proceeding is, as already observed, curiously characteristic of the people, and the deep disguise they can assume to attain their purposes.

It was intimated to Si Tundo, that if he could raise a certain sum of money, the woman should be made over to him; and to render this the more probable, the affair was taken out of Macota's hands, and placed at the decision of the Orang Kaya de Gadong, who *was friendly* to the offenders, but who received his private orders how to act. Four men were appointed to watch their opportunity, in order to seize the culprits. It is not to be imagined, however, that a native would trust or believe the friendly assurances held out to him; nor was it so in the case of Si Tundo and his companion; they attended at the Orang Kaya de Gadong's house frequently for weeks, with the same precautions, and it was found impossible to overpower them; but the deceit of their enemies was equal to the occasion, and delay brought no change of purpose. They were to die, and opportunity alone was wanting to carry the sentence into effect. Time passed over, suspicion was lulled; and as suspicion was lulled, the professions to serve them became more frequent. Poor Si Tundo brought *all* his little property to make good the price required for the woman, and his friend added his share; but it was still far short of the required amount. Hopes, however, were still held out; the Orang Kaya advanced a small sum to assist, and other *pretended* friends slowly and reluctantly, at his request, lent a little money. The negotiation was nearly complete; forty or fifty reals only were wanting, and the opposite party were ready to deliver the lady whenever the sum was made good. A final conference was appointed for the conclusion of the bargain at the Orang Kaya's, at which numbers were present; and the devoted victims, lulled into fatal security, had ceased to bring their formidable kempilans. At the last interview the forty reals being still deficient, the Orang Kaya proposed receiving their gold-mounted krisses in pledge for the amount. The krisses were given up, and the bargain was complete; when the four executioners threw themselves on the unarmed men, and, assisted by others, overpowered and secured them. Si Tundo, wounded in the scuffle, and bound, surrounded by enemies flourishing their krisses, remarked, "You have taken me by treachery; openly you could not have seized me." He spoke no more. They triumphed over and insulted him, as though some great feat had been achieved; and every kris was plunged into his body, which was afterwards cast, without burial, into the river. Si Tundo's relation was spared on pleading for mercy; and after his whole property, even to his clothes, was confiscated, he was allowed to retire to Sadung. Thus perished poor Si Tundo, a Magindano pirate, with many, if not all, the vices of the native character; but with boldness, courage, and constancy, which retrieved his faults, and raised him in the estimation of brave men. In person he was tall, elegantly made, with small and handsome features, and quiet and graceful manners; but towards the Malays even of rank, there was in his bearing a suppressed contempt which they often felt, but could not well resent. Alas, my gallant comrade! I mourn your death, and could have better spared a better man; for as long as you lived, I had one faithful follower of tried courage, amongst the natives. Peace be with you in the world to come; and may the Great God pardon your sins and judge you mercifully.'—Vol. i. pp. 202, &c.

The following is an account of a robbery committed by Macota's followers:—

'They beat the old man, threw him into the water, and robbed him of a tael of gold. The beating and attempt at drowning were certain; for the Chinese hadji was so ill for several days under my care, that he was in considerable danger. He complained to me loudly of Macota; and from other sources I gained a pretty accurate account of that gentleman's proceedings. By threats, by intrigue, by falsehood, and even by violence, he had prevented or driven all persons from daring to visit or come near me whether abroad or ashore. He was taxing the poor Dyaks, harassing the Siniawans, and leagued with the Borneo pangerans to plunder and get all he possibly could. Every Dyak community was watched by his followers, and a spear raised opposite the chief's house, to intimate that no person was to trade or barter except the pangeran. The mode of plunder is thus perpetrated. Rice, clothes, gongs, and other articles are sent to a tribe at a fixed price, which the Dyaks dare not refuse, for it is at the risk of losing their children! The prices thus demanded by Macota were as follows: one gantong of rice for thirty birds'-nests. Twenty-four gantongs here is equal to a pecul of rice—a pecul of rice costs one dollar and a half, whereas thirty birds'-nests weigh one catty, and are valued at two rupees; so that the twenty-fourth part of one and a half dollars is sold for two rupees! Was it surprising that these people were poor and wretched? My astonishment was, that they continued to labour, and indeed nothing but their being a surprisingly industrious race can account for it; and they are only enabled to live at all by secreting a portion of their food. Yet war and bad government, or rather no government, have had the effect of driving more than half the Dyak tribes beyond the limits of Sarāwak.

'The rapacity of these Malays is as unbounded as it is short-sighted; for one would think that the slightest degree of common sense would induce some of the chiefs to allow no one to plunder except themselves. But this is so far from being the case, that when their demand has been enforced, dozens of inferior wretches extort and plunder in turn, each according to his ability; and though the Dyak is not wanting in obstinacy, he can seldom withstand these robberies; for each levy is made in the name of the rajah, or some principal pangeran; and the threat of bringing the powerful tribe of Sakarrans or Sarebus to deprive them of their heads, and wives and families, generally reduces them to obedience. Whilst on this subject, I may as well mention a fact that came later to my knowledge, when several of the Dyak chiefs, and one of particular intelligence, Si Meta by name, assured me that each family paid direct revenue from thirty to fifty pasus (tubs) of padi, besides all the other produces, which are extorted at merely nominal prices.'—Vol. i. pp. 245, &c.

Another most shameful mode of exaction and tyranny is also practised.

'It consists in lending small sums of money to the natives (that is, Sarāwak people), and demanding interest at the rate of fifty per cent. per month; by this means a small sum is quickly converted into one which is quite out of the power of the poor man to pay; and he, his wife, and children, are taken to the house of the creditor to work for him, whilst the debt still accumulates, and the labour is endless. I intend to strike at this slavery in disguise, but not just yet; the suppression of robbery, the criminal department of justice, being more immediately important.'—Vol. i. pp. 279, &c.

'The government of the Dyaks I have already detailed; and though we might hope that in a more settled state of things they would have been more secure from foreign pillage, yet they were annually deprived of the proceeds of their labour, debarred from trade, and deprived of every motive to encourage industry. The character of their rulers for humanity alone fixed the measure of their suffering, and bad was the best; but it seems to be a maxim amongst all classes of Malays, that force alone can keep the Dyaks in proper subjection; which is so far true, that force alone, and the hopelessness of resistance, could induce a wild people to part with the food on which they depend for subsistence. At a distance I have heard of and pitied the sufferings of the negroes and the races of New Holland—yet it was the cold feeling dictated by reason and humanity; but now, having witnessed the miseries of a race superior to either, the feeling glows with the fervour of personal commiseration: so true is it that visible misery will raise us to exertion, which the picture, however powerfully delineated, can never produce. The thousands daily knelled out of the world, who lie in gorgeous sepulchres, or rot unburied on the surface of the earth, excite no emotion compared to that conjured up by the meanest dead at our feet. We read of tens of thousands killed and wounded in battle, and the glory of their deeds, or the sense of their defeat, attracts our sympathy; but if a single mangled warrior, ghastly with wounds and writhing with pain, solicited our aid, we should deplore his fate with tenfold emotion, and curse the strife which led to such a result. Among the thousands starving for want of food we trouble not ourselves to seek one; but if the object is presented before our eyes, how certain a compassion is aroused! To assist is a duty; but in the performance of this duty, to be gentle and feeling is godlike, and probably, between individuals, there is no greater distinction than in this tender sympathy towards distress. Poor, poor Dyaks! exposed to starvation, slavery, death! you may well raise the warmest feelings of compassion—enthusiasm awakes at witnessing your sufferings! To save men from death has its merit; but to alleviate suffering, to ameliorate all the ills of slavery, to protect these tribes from pillage and yearly scarcity, is far nobler; and if, in the endeavour to do so, one poor life is sacrificed, how little is it in the vast amount of human existence!'—Vol. i. pp. 270, &c.

Mr. Brooke is anxious, in the later portions of his journal, to give as favourable an idea as possible of the Malay character; and he states his opinion, that the prejudice against them is founded more on the character of the rajahs and their dependants than on the mass. We strongly suspect, however, that whoever was rajah (of course excepting the present Rajah of Sarāwak) the result would be the same.

'28*th*.—How is it to be accounted for that the Malays have so bad a character with the public, and yet that the few who have had opportunities of knowing them well speak of them as a simple and not unamiable people? With the vulgar, the idea of a Malay—and by the Malay they mean the entire Polynesian race, with the exception of the Javanese—is that of a treacherous, bloodthirsty villain; and I believe the reason to be, that from our first intercourse to the present time, it is the pangerans or rajahs of the country, with their followers, who are made the standard of Malay character. These rajahs, born in the purple, bred amid slaves and fighting-cocks, inheriting an undisputed power over their subjects, and under all circumstances, whether of riches or poverty, receiving the abject submission of those around their persons, are naturally the slaves of their passions—haughty, rapacious, vindictive, weak, and tenacious unto death of the paltry punctilio of their court. The followers of such rajahs it is needless to describe;—they are the tools of the rajah's will, and more readily disposed for evil than for good; unscrupulous, cunning, intriguing, they are prepared for any act of violence. We must next contrast these with a burly, independent trader, eager after gain, probably not over-scrupulous about the means of obtaining it, ignorant of native character, and heedless of native customs and native etiquette. The result of such a combination of ingredients causes an explosion on the slightest occasion. The European is loud, contemptuous, and abusive; the Malay cool and vindictive. The regal dignity has been insulted; the rajah has received "shame" before his court; evil counsellors are at hand to whisper the facility of revenge, and the advantages to be derived from it. The consequence too frequently follows—the captain and crew are krissed, and their vessel seized and appropriated. The repeated tragedy shocks the European mind; and the Malay has received, and continues to this day to receive, a character for treachery and bloodthirstiness. Even in these common cases an allowance must be made for the insults received, which doubtless on numerous occasions were very gross, and such flagrant violations of native customs as to merit death in native eyes; and we must bear in mind, that we never hear but one side of the tale, or only judge upon a bloody fact. It is from such samples of Malays that the general character is given by those who have only the limited means of trade for forming a judgment; but those who have known the people of the interior and lived amongst them, far removed from the influence of their rajahs, have given them a very different character. Simple in their habits, they are neither treacherous nor bloodthirsty; cheerful, polite, hospitable, gentle in their manners, they live in communities with fewer crimes and fewer punishments than most other people of the globe. They are passionately fond of their children, and indulgent even to a fault; and the ties of family relationship and good feeling continue in force for several generations. The feeling of the Malay, fostered by education, is acute, and his passions are roused if shame be put upon him; indeed, this dread of shame amounts to a disease; and the evil is, that it has taken a wrong direction, being more the dread of exposure or abuse, than shame or contrition for any offence.

'I have always found them good-tempered and obliging, wonderfully amenable to authority, and quite as sensible of benefits conferred, and as grateful, as other people of more favoured countries. Of course there is a reverse to this picture. The worst feature of the Malay character is the want of all candour or openness, and the restless spirit of cunning intrigue which animates them, from the highest to the lowest. Like other Asiatics, truth is a rare quality amongst them. They are superstitious, somewhat inclined to deceit in the ordinary concerns of life, and they have neither principle nor conscience when they have the means of oppressing an infidel, and a Dyak who is their inferior in civilization and intellect.

'If this character of the Malay be summed up, it will be anything but a bad one on the whole; it will present a striking contrast to the conduct and character of the rajahs and their followers, and I think will convince any impartial inquirer, that it is easily susceptible of improvement. One of the most fertile sources of confusion is, classing at one time all the various nations of the Archipelago under the general name of Malay, and at another restricting the same term to one people, not more ancient, not the fountain-head of the others, who issued from the centre of Sumatra, and spread themselves in a few parts of the Archipelago.'—Vol. ii. pp. 129, &c.

No small portion of our work is devoted to the subject of the pirates who infest every river, and bring terror to every quiet inhabitant of the island. These are composed chiefly of certain tribes of Dyaks, deriving their name from the river where they emerge on their pestilential errands. They differ very much in their equipments, and in the field of their exertions. Some keep close to shore, and commit depredations on the small craft of the coast, or on the villages adjoining; others, better armed, venture out far to sea, and attack ships laden with merchandise; while some are strangely in league with the Malay authorities, who, in the tender care they exercise over those their subjects, will sometimes admit these pirates up the rivers, on the condition of sharing the spoil. As this part of the population will, however, soon meet with a serious check to their operations, if they have not done so already, from the severe lessons which have been taught some of their number, we hope that they will remain only in history; and as we are not inclined to invest their memory with any cloak of romance, as is often the case with celebrated robbers, we will content ourselves with giving an extract or two descriptive of their signal discomfiture at the hands of Captain Keppel and the gallant crew of the 'Dido.'

'*June* 11*th.*—We moved on immediately after the passing up of the bore, the dangers of which appeared to have been greatly exaggerated. The beating of gongs and discharge of cannon had been going on the whole of the previous night.

'The scenery improved in beauty every yard that we advanced; but our attention was drawn from it by the increase of yelling as we approached the scene of action. Although as yet we had only heard our enemies, our rapid advance with a strong tide must have been seen by them from the jungle on the various hills which now rose to our view.

'Being in my gig, somewhat ahead of the boats, I had the advantage of observing all that occurred. The scene was the most exciting I ever experienced. We had no time for delay or consideration: the tide was sweeping us rapidly up; and had we been inclined to retreat then, we should have found it difficult. A sudden turn in the river brought us (Mr. Brooke was by my side) in front of a steep hill which rose from the bank. It had been cleared of jungle, and long grass grew in its place. As we hove in sight, several hundred savages rose up, and gave one of their war-yells: it was the first I had heard. No report from musketry or ordnance could ever make a man's heart feel so *small* as mine did at that horrid yell: but I had no leisure to think. I had only time for a shot at them with my double-barrel as they rushed down the steep, whilst I was carried past. I soon after heard the report of our large boat's heavy gun, which must have convinced them that we likewise were prepared.

'On the roof of a long building, on the summit of the hill, were several warriors performing a war-dance, which it would be difficult to imitate on such a stage. As these were not the forts we were in search of, we did not delay longer than to exchange a few shots in sweeping along.

'Our next obstacle was more troublesome, being a strong barrier right across the river, formed of two rows of trees placed firmly in the mud, with their tops crossed and secured together by rattans; and along the fork, formed by the crossing of the tops of these stakes, were other trees firmly secured. Rapidly approaching this barrier, I observed a small opening that might probably admit of a canoe; and gathering good way, and putting my gig's head straight at it, I squeezed through. On passing it the scene again changed, and I had before me three formidable-looking forts, which lost not a moment in opening a discharge of cannon on my unfortunate gig. Luckily their guns were properly elevated for the range of the barrier; and, with the exception of a few straggling grape-shot that splashed the water round us, the whole went over our heads. For a moment I found myself cut off from my companions, and drifting fast upon the enemy. The banks of the river were covered with warriors, yelling and rushing down to possess themselves of my boat and its crew. I had some difficulty in getting my long gig round, and paddling up against the stream; but while my friend Brooke steered the boat, my coxswain and myself kept up a fire, with tolerable aim, on the embrasures, to prevent, if possible, their reloading before the pinnace, our leading boat, could bring her twelve-pound carronade to bear. I was too late to prevent the pinnace falling athwart the barrier, in which position she had three men wounded. With the assistance of some of our native followers, the rattan-lashings which secured the heads of the stakes were soon cut through; and I was not sorry when I found the 'Dido's' first cutter on the same side with myself. The other boats soon followed; and while the pinnace kept up a destructive fire on the fort, Mr. D'Aeth, who was the first to land, jumped on shore, with his crew, at the foot of the hill on the top of which the nearest fort stood, and at once rushed for the summit. This mode of warfare—this dashing at once in the very face of their fort—was so novel and incomprehensible to our enemies, that they fled, panic-struck, into the jungle; and it was with the greatest difficulty that our leading men could get even a snap-shot at the rascals as they went.'—Vol. ii. pp. 48, &c.

'To the left of our position, and about 200 yards up the river, large trees were being felled during the night; and by the torch-lights showing the spot, the officer of the boat, Mr. Partridge, kept up a very fair ball-practice with the pinnace's gun. Towards morning a shot fell apparently just where they were at work; and that being accompanied by what we afterwards ascertained caused more horror and consternation among the enemy than any thing else, a common signal sky-rocket, made them resign the ground entirely to us. The last shot, too, that was fired from the pinnace had killed three men.'—Vol. ii. p. 58.

A truce being at length declared, Mr. Brooke made the best use of the influence which their victory had given him.

'He fully explained that our invasion of their country, and destruction of their forts and town, was not for the purpose of pillage or gain to ourselves, but as a punishment for their repeated and aggravated acts of piracy; that they had been fully warned, for two years before, that the British nation would no longer allow the native trade between the adjacent islands and Singapore to be cut off and plundered, and the crews of the vessels cruelly put to death, as they had been.

'They were very humble and submissive; admitted that their lives were forfeited; and if we said they were to die, they were prepared, although, they explained, they were equally willing to live. They promised to refrain for ever from piracy, and offered hostages for their good behaviour.

'Mr. Brooke then explained how much more advantageous trade would be than piracy, and invited them to a further conference at Sarāwak, where they might witness all the blessings resulting from the line of conduct he had advised them to follow. If, on the other hand, we heard of a single act of piracy being committed by them, their country should be again invaded and occupied; and their enemies, the whole tribe of Linga Dyaks, let loose upon them, until they were rooted out and utterly destroyed.'—Vol. ii. pp. 60, &c.

The following attack on Patusen is of the same character:—

'We now collected our boats, and made our arrangements as well as we could, for attacking a place we had not yet seen. We had now a little more difficulty in keeping our native force back, as many of those who had accompanied the expedition last year had gained so much confidence that the desire of plunder exceeded the feeling of fear.

'After weighing at eleven, with a strong tide sweeping us up, we were not many minutes in coming in sight of the fortifications of Patusen; and indeed they were not to be despised. There were five of them, two not quite finished. Getting suddenly into six-feet water, we anchored the steamer; not so formidable a berth, although well within musket-range, as we might have taken up had I been aware of the increasing depth of water nearer the town; but we approached so rapidly there was no time to wait the interpretation of the pilot's information.

'The 'Dido' and 'Phlegethon's' boats were not long in forming alongside. They were directed to pull in shore, and then attack the forts in succession; but my gallant first-lieutenant, Wade, who had the command, was the first to break the line, and pull directly in the face of the largest fort. His example was followed by the others; and dividing, each boat pulled for that which appeared to the officer in command to be the one most likely to make a good fight. The forts were the first to open fire on both steamer and boats, which was quickly and smartly returned. It is impossible to imagine a prettier sight than it was from the top of the 'Phlegethon's' paddle-box. It was my intention to have fired on the enemy from the steamer, so as to draw their attention off the boats; but owing to the defective state of the detonating priming-tubes, the guns from the vessel did not go off, and the boats had all the glory to themselves.

'They never once checked in their advance; but the moment they touched the shore the crews rushed up, entering the forts at the embrasures, while the pirates fled by the rear.

'In this sharp and short affair we had but one man killed, poor John Ellis, a fine young man, and captain of the main-top in the 'Dido.' He was cut in two by a cannon-shot while in the act of ramming home a cartridge in the bow-gun of the 'Jolly Bachelor.' Standing close to poor Ellis at the fatal moment was a fine promising young middy, Charles Johnson, a nephew of Mr. Brooke's, who fortunately escaped unhurt. This, and two others badly wounded, were the only accidents on our side.

'Our native allies were not long in following our men on shore. The killed and wounded on the part of the pirates must have been considerable. Our followers got several heads. There were no fewer than sixty-four brass guns of different sizes, besides many iron, found in and about the forts: the latter we spiked and threw into the river. The town was very extensive; and after being well looted, made a glorious blaze.'—Vol. ii. pp. 88, &c.

Considerable peril was incurred in these expeditions.

'As yet the banks of the river had been a continued garden, with sugar-cane plantations and banana-trees in abundance. As we advanced, the scenery assumed a wilder and still more beautiful appearance, presenting high steep points, with large overhanging trees, and occasionally forming into pretty picturesque bays, with sloping banks. At other times we approached narrow gorges, looking so dark that, until past, you almost doubted there being a passage through. We were in hopes that this morning we should have reached their capital, a place called Karangan, supposed to be about ten miles further on. At nine o'clock Mr. Brooke, who was with me in the gig, stopped to breakfast with young Jenkins in the second cutter. Not expecting to meet with any opposition for some miles, I gave permission to Patingi Ali to advance cautiously with his light division, and with positive instructions to fall back upon the first appearance of any natives. As the stream was running down very strong, we held on to the bank, waiting for the arrival of the second cutter. Our pinnace and second gig having both passed up, we had remained about a quarter of an hour, when the report of a few musket-shots told us that the pirates had been fallen in with. We immediately pushed on; and as we advanced, the increased firing from our boats, and the war-yells of some thousand Dyaks, let us know that an engagement had really commenced. It would be difficult to describe the scene as I found it. About twenty boats were jammed together, forming one confused mass; some bottom up; the bows or sterns of others only visible; mixed up, pell-mell, with huge rafts; and amongst which were nearly all our advanced little division. Headless trunks, as well as heads without bodies, were lying about in all directions; parties were engaged hand to hand, spearing and krissing each other; others were striving to swim for their lives; entangled in the common *mêlée* were our advanced boats; while on both banks thousands of Dyaks were rushing down to join in the slaughter, hurling their spears and stones on the boats below. For a moment I was at a loss what steps to take for rescuing our people from the embarrassed position in which they were, as the whole mass (through which there was no passage) were floating down the stream, and the addition of fresh boats arriving only increased the confusion. Fortunately, at this critical moment one of the rafts, catching the stump of a tree, broke this floating bridge, making a passage, through which (my gig being being propelled by paddles instead of oars) I was enabled to pass.

'It occurred to Mr. Brooke and myself simultaneously, that, by advancing in the gig, we should draw the attention of the pirates towards us, so as to give time for the other boats to clear themselves. This had the desired effect. The whole force on shore turned, as if to secure what they rashly conceived to be their prize.

'We now advanced mid-channel: spears and stones assailed us from both banks. My friend Brooke's gun would not go off; so giving him the yoke-lines, he steered the boat, while I kept up a rapid fire. Mr. Allen, in the second gig, quickly coming up, opened upon them, from a congreve-rocket tube, such a destructive fire as caused them to retire panic-struck behind the temporary barriers where they had concealed themselves previous to the attack upon Patingi Ali, and from whence they continued, for some twenty minutes, to hurl their spears and other missiles.'—Vol. ii. pp. 110, &c.

One more extract under this head will suffice.

'"The pirates on the coast of Borneo may be classed into those who make long voyages in large heavy-armed prahus, such as the Illanuns, Balagnini, &c.; and the lighter Dyak fleets, which make short but destructive excursions in swift prahus, and seek to surprise rather than openly to attack their prey. A third, and probably the worst class, are usually half-bred Arab Seriffs, who possessing themselves of the territory of some Malay state, form a nucleus for piracy, a rendezvous and market for all the roving fleets; and although occasionally sending out their own followers, they more frequently seek profit by making advances, in food, arms, and gunpowder, to all who will agree to repay them at an exorbitant rate in slaves.

'"The Dyaks of Sarebus and Sakarran were under the influence of two Arab Seriffs, who employed them on piratical excursions, and shared in equal parts of the plunder obtained. I had once the opportunity of counting ninety-eight boats about to start on a cruise; and reckoning the crew of each boat at the moderate average of twenty-five men, it gives a body of 2,450 men on a piratical excursion. The piracies of these Arab Seriffs and their Dyaks were so notorious, that it is needless to detail them here; but one curious feature, which throws a light on the state of society, I cannot forbear mentioning. On all occasions of a Dyak fleet being about to make a piratical excursion, a gong was beat round the town ordering a particular number of Malays to embark; and in case any one failed to obey, he was fined the sum of thirty rupees by the seriff of the place.

'"The blow struck by Captain Keppel, of her Majesty's ship 'Dido,' on these two communities was so decisive as to have put an entire end to their piracies; the leaders, Seriff Sahib and Seriff Muller, had fled; the Malay population has been dispersed; and the Dyaks so far humbled as to sue for protection; and in future, by substituting local Malay rulers of good character in lieu of the piratical Seriffs, a check will be placed on the Dyaks, and they may be broken of their piratical habits, in as far as interferes with the trade of the coast."'—Vol. ii. pp. 144, &c.

But it is time that we should now sum up with a glance towards the future. We have followed Mr. Brooke from the commencement of his expedition to his return home, and we have seen the character he gives of the inhabitants of the island, and his accuracy is amply borne witness to by the influence he succeeded in gaining over them. Let us now consider what his position will be on his return. He came to England to complete his proposed arrangements, to be invested with authority, and to take back helping hands. He has presented his country with the fruits of his individual labours, and henceforth will, therefore, act more directly as an emissary from the British nation; most essential, then, is it that his powers and his position should be proportioned to the anticipated advantage of his exertions. In secular affairs our government has not been neglectful. Mr. Brooke will return with his own Rajahship of Sarāwak, and of the independent Chiefs of Borneo, acknowledged by the home government; he is also gazetted as Governor and Commander-in-Chief in and over the island of Labuan and its dependencies. The following announcement also gives us good assurance that physical force will not be wanting to carry out his wishes. We take it from *The Times*, and its purport must be most pleasing to Mr. Brooke.

'In addition to other marks of appreciation which will be conferred by Her Majesty upon the enterprising Englishman who has done so much for the interests of his country during his residence in Borneo, the 'Meander,' of forty-four guns, commissioned at Chatham on Monday last by Lieutenant Reed, late of the 'Asia,' and to be commanded by the Hon. Henry Keppel, late of the 'Dido,' eighteen guns, recently returned from service in the Chinese seas, will convey his Excellency, Governor James Brooke, to Borneo, the scene of his former labours, in the early part of next year, and remain at that station to assist him in protecting the interests of Great Britain in that quarter of the world. Several of the parties who served in the 'Dido' have applied to the Admiralty for permission to serve in the 'Meander,' under their former gallant commander; and it is expected she will be ready for sea and leave this country for Borneo early in February next.'

Mr. Brooke, however, would not confine himself to secular means or secular ends; he wishes to do his duty generally towards the people he is brought in contact with, and is aware that that duty consists in giving them the opportunity of hearing the truths of the Gospel, as well as of entering into commercial relations with other lands. An appeal is thus made to the English Church, and sad would it be if it were not properly responded to. No further comment is necessary from us on the subject; we will simply reprint the following paper which has been circulated relative to it, and are happy to add that a considerable sum has been collected.

'Oxford, Nov. 25, 1847.

'As some expression of the feeling with which the visit of James Brooke, Esq., Rajah of Sarāwak, to the University of Oxford, has been received by its members, it is proposed to raise a fund by contributions, however small, in furtherance of that object without which a Christian mission cannot be effectually or permanently established, the creation of an Episcopate in Borneo.'

'Dec. 3, 1847.

'It is proposed, that the sum collected (with strict reservation for the purpose of the donors) should be placed in the hands of the Borneo Mission Committee in London.'

ART. III.—1. *The Constitution of the Church of the Future. A practical explanation of the correspondence with the Right Hon. W. Gladstone, on the German Church, Episcopacy and Jerusalem, &c.* *By* CHRISTIAN CHARLES JOSIAS BUNSEN, D.PH. D.C.L. London: Longman & Co.

2. *Fragment on the Church.* 2d Edition. *With Appendices on the same subject.* *By* THOMAS ARNOLD, D.D. Late Head-master of Rugby School. London: Fellowes.

3. *Principles of Church Reform.* By the same. London: Fellowes.

IT is by no means a capricious or accidental combination which leads us to unite for connected consideration the three publications, the titles of which we have prefixed to this article. On the contrary, although the different date of their publication, and the different circumstances under which they were composed might seem to disconnect them in some degree from one another, yet they are as essentially parts of one and the same whole, as if they merely formed separate chapters of the same book, or consecutive discussions, by the same author, of different portions of the same subject.

They contain a theory of the Church of Christ, and its proposed application. Mr. Bunsen's book, consisting of two parts, states in the former part the theory, (rather, it is true, in a Germanized form in point of method and expression,) and in the latter its proposed application to the condition of his own country. Dr. Arnold's fragment exhibits, in a more English manner, the identical theory, whilst his pamphlet, published a good many years since, and under widely different circumstances from those in which the Church is now placed, offers suggestions as to its practical application to the reform of the Church in England.

We need not say how much respect is due to the two writers: the one, by all confession, one of the most learned men of the age, the worthy successor of Niebuhr, the hospitable entertainer of every English scholar who visited Rome during the time of his residence in that city, the confidential minister and friend of the most earnest, according to his views, of European sovereigns;—the other, the most true, simple, conscientious of mankind; one who has impressed upon hundreds of pupils by his instruction and example, and upon hundreds of those who never saw his face, by his published correspondence, the most vivid conception of energy, earnestness, goodness, and sincerity.

Nor need we say how closely and exactly these two writers sympathize in view and feelings. Dr. Arnold, to select one passage out of many, speaks thus in his correspondence (vol. ii. p. 265,) of the Chevalier Bunsen, 'I scarcely know one amongst 'my dearest friends, except Bunsen, whom I do not believe to 'be in some point or other in gross error.'

M. Bunsen speaks not less strongly in the following words:—

> 'It is a token full of comfort, that in our own age no one has conceived and presented the truth of the universal priesthood of Christians with so much life, and in such close connexion with the very marrow of Christian doctrine, and has made it tell once more so powerfully, convincingly, and extensively against the assumptions of the clergy church, as another clergyman of the Episcopal Church of England—Arnold. That truth was the centre point from which he started in all his thoughts and researches, and the deep and immovable foundation of his spiritual convictions with regard to the Church. The spirit of this revered apostle of the free Church of the Future, departed before he had completed the great work of his life, his book on the Church. He has been taken from amongst us before the stern combat has begun in earnest on either side. But he has left to his own people, whose love and veneration is his worthiest monument, and to us all, a living and life-inspiring testimony, not only in his writings, but in his whole life,—the model of an enlightened, faithful, and disinterested inquirer after Christian truth, and of a spirit of love and humility, not less than of freedom and power.'—*Church of the Future*, p. 221.

We have quoted these passages in order to show merely the sympathy and close agreement of these two writers in views and feelings. Let us add to them others, which express the opinion they entertain of the present crisis in the history of the Church, their judgment of past times, and their expectation of the immediate future.

> 'Liberty of conscience,' says Mr. Bunsen, describing the present religious state of Christendom, 'has been won, and civil liberty secured. Freedom without religion will no longer satisfy the Romanic nations, nor religion without freedom the Germanic. Among the leading nations of Europe, science has been invested with its proper privileges, either by the free consent of the rulers and clergy, or as the necessary consequence of civil liberty. Freedom of conscience has come to be considered as implied in the very idea of liberty, even in countries where as yet but little sense of personal moral responsibility is awakened: private judgment in spiritual matters,' (that is, the application to them of reason and conscience,) recognised on the one side as a right, and on the other declared to be a duty, is exercised by many, is demanded by all . . . . The harmonious interchange of power between heaven and earth is restored: the charm between the visible and invisible is spanned: the barrier between the secular and the spiritual is broken down . . . . Thus the world has entered upon one of those great critical epochs, when nations either unfold new powers of life, or perish. We believe they will do the former. Now or never is the time for governments and nations to come to a clear understanding with respect to Christianity, the import of the Church and her constitution.'—*Bunsen*, p. 28.

The Church, at the Reformation, 'first began to appear in the world in that full reality of which its former existence was but a shadow.' P. 67.

'He (Luther) saw clearly the impossibility of making the husk of the perishing part contain the fruit of the new life just commencing.' P. 26.

'It is undeniable that the old forms are perishing, and that men, consciously or unconsciously, are striving on all sides to arrive at a new and more perfect organization of the Church.' P. 48.

'We, for our part, betake ourselves in faith to the open sea of the freedom of the spirit.' P. 59.

'We must get rid of the narrowness and confused terminology of the Clergy-Churches, and endeavour, in faith and love, to draw forth our proposed restoration, according to the true idea of the Church, from the inmost heart of the present, not to construct it out of the dead bones of the past.' P. 84.

Dr. Arnold's language is not materially different from this:—

'So when the husk cracks, and would fain fall to pieces by the natural swelling of the seed within, a foolish zeal labours to hold it together: they who would deliver the seed are taxed with longing to destroy it; they who are smothering it, pretend that they are treading in the good old ways, and that the husk was, is, and ever will be essential. And this happens because men regard the form and not the substance; because they think that to echo the language of their forefathers, is to be the faithful imitators of their spirit; because they are blind to all the lessons which nature teaches them, and would for ever keep the eggshell unbroken, and the sheath of the leaf unburst, not seeing that the wisdom of winter is the folly of spring.'—*Fragm. of the Church*, p. 121.

We think, that if any person carefully considers these passages which we have quoted, he will agree that it is not unimportant to remark the very peculiar and strong expressions in which these two writers describe each other. It is the deliberate meaning of both, that we have reached a time in which the past constitution of the Church is as a husk, about to break with a seed full of new life, or as an egg about to open and develope a new and hitherto unseen being. Each proposes a complete restoration, or reformation, and one which will set at nought, as corrupt and useless, all that the Church has held and thought on the subject for eighteen hundred years. Each regards the other as the one man who has adequately conceived and duly represented the true idea of that which is to succeed to the obsolete and decayed Church of the past. It is really not venturing, then, at all beyond the exact and literal truth to represent them both, as being, each in the other's judgment, what Mr. Bunsen calls his lamented friend, 'the Apostles of the 'Church of the Future.'

The Apostles of the Church of the Future! It is a startling sound; one, which may well startle those who thought they already lived, and were happy and peaceful in thinking so, in a Church of the past, the present, and the future, 'built upon 'the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ him-'self being the head corner-stone.'

Let us then, in all seriousness, set ourselves to examine the grounds of this startling, and wonderful title: which, though it may not have been assumed with the lofty meaning which we have assigned to it, does really not exceed the vocation with which these two writers appear to regard themselves as designated to open the husk of the hitherto imperfect and undeveloped Church, and usher into destined life its new and more perfect organization. Let us ask for the signs, the tokens, the proofs from God. If these be not forthcoming, let us demand what are the arguments which are exhibited, in order to induce us to believe that the Church of God, corrupted in the first age, went on deepening its guilt and evil till the sixteenth century after Christ; that then it began to appear in the world in that full reality of which its former existence was but a shadow; that a dead and dreary period has elapsed since, during which all Church polities rest either on the remains of the earlier period, or on the mere negation of it; that now both of those things, the ‘ruins of the old Clergy-Church, as well as those modern ‘systems which are built up upon the mere denial of what was ‘false in it,’ must be swept away, in order to make room for the living restoration of the Church?

The answer is simple. These two writers claim to have found out, from the Scriptures, that the Episcopal Constitution of the Church Universal as held for sixteen hundred years was not only a corruption of the original divine institution, but a corruption so gross that it is heresy[1] to esteem it necessary to Church membership on the part of individuals; a corruption so early and universal, that ‘the germs of the mischief may be here and there discernible’[2] in the first Christian writers,—that this ‘false ‘and superstitious notion of a Church—the very mystery of ‘iniquity—began in the first century, and had no more to do ‘with Rome in the outset, than with Alexandria, Antioch, or ‘Carthage;’[3] that ‘the Church, early in the second century, was ‘ready to slide into the doctrine of a priesthood, with all its ‘accompanying corruptions of Christian truth;’[4] a corruption so total, that ‘now, the true and grand idea of a Church, that ‘is, a society for the purpose of making men like Christ,—earth ‘like heaven,—the kingdoms of the world the kingdom of ‘Christ,—is all lost;’[5] a corruption so shocking, that ‘if,’ says Mr. Bunsen, ‘an angel from heaven should manifest to me that, ‘by introducing, or advocating, or merely favouring the introduction of such an episcopacy’ (as should be esteemed, ‘on principle and catholically,’ necessary to the due constitution of the Church, and so to the full membership of Christians,) 'into 'any part of Germany, I should not only make the German 'nation glorious and powerful above all the nations of the 'world, but should successfully combat the unbelief, pantheism, 'and atheism of the day—I would *not* do it: so help me God. 'Amen.'[1]

---

[1] Bunsen, p. 68.
[2] Arnold, p. 58.
[3] Arnold, Corresp. ii. 61.
[4] Arnold, p. 123.
[5] Arnold, Corresp. ii. 15.

They claim to have discovered, instead of this immemorial, universal, episcopal constitution (episcopal, we mean, as a matter of 'principle and catholically') *another*.

Of this newly discovered constitution, it does not matter though there should be no traces either in the writers of the early Church, or in the early Church institutions. Dr. Arnold does, indeed, *condescend* to adduce the writers of the early Church as witnesses to his hypothesis: but he takes good care that his readers should understand how great a condescension he makes in so doing.

> 'The chapter which I am now going to write,' he says, 'is, in truth, superfluous. Nay, although its particular object were proved ever so fully, yet this would be a less gain than loss, if any were by the nature of the argument encouraged to believe that we are to seek for our knowledge of Christianity any where else but in the Scriptures. What we find there is a part of Christianity, whether recognised as such or no in after ages: what we do not find there is no part of Christianity, however early or however general may have been the attempts to interpolate it.'—*Arnold*, p. 47.

In this temper he begins his examination of early writers. After adducing various passages from them, and applying to them, we cannot but think, more forced and unnatural modes of interpretation than any ordinary principles will justify, he concludes by rejoicing that he is 'spared the pain of believing 'that Christianity was grossly corrupted in the very next generation after the Apostles by the men who professed themselves 'to be the Apostles' true followers.'[2] So that in the former passage he shows how little he is disposed to esteem even the universal voice of Christendom, unless it should coincide with his own individual views of Scriptural interpretation, whilst in the latter he almost proclaims how unhesitatingly he would have rejected even the most primitive records of the Post-Apostolic Church, if they had resisted his strong explanatory wrestings. Indeed, we can hardly conceive language stronger to this point than Dr. Arnold's in another place:

> 'Thus, then, as the Scriptures wholly disclaim these notions of a human priesthood; *as the perfection of knowledge to which they would have us aspire consists in rejecting such notions wholly;* it is strictly, as I said, superfluous to inquire into the opinions of early Christian writers, because, if these uphold the doctrine of the priesthood ever so strongly, it would but show

---

[1] Bunsen, Corresp. p. xlvii.

[2] Arnold, p. 117.

that the state of mind of which the Epistle to the Hebrews complains, was afterwards more universal, and more remote from Christian perfection.'—*Arnold*, p. 57.

Is there not something marvellous, as a mere piece of *natural history*, in the confidence with which this writer holds his own personal interpretations of Holy Scripture?

But we must allow writers of such powers to unfold their Church theory for themselves. It is in a beautiful passage, of which the following is an extract, that Mr. Bunsen begins the statement of his view.

'All religions whatever have for their inward ground that feeling of need which springs from the interruption of man's union with God by sin, and for their final object that re-union for which, however dimly and uncertainly, men were encouraged to hope. All their sacrifices were attempts at this restoration, founded on this hope. But it was not possible that such attempts should ever fully realise that to which they aspired; and this for two reasons: in the first place, because, if considered as mere symbolical outward acts, they could of course effect nothing in a matter where that which is essentially inward, namely, the moral disposition of the heart towards God, is concerned: and in the second place, because it was not in man's power really to consummate that inward act, which their outward sacrifices expressed. Perfect thankfulness is only possible for the man who feels himself perfectly at one with God; and, therefore, that divided feeling with respect to God, which, as we have said before, is the prominent feature in man's religious sentiment, prevents the feeling of separation, of sin, of alienation from God, from being ever permanently merged in thankfulness. And thus the soul, although thankful, and ready to offer itself in thankfulness as a living sacrifice unto God, is necessarily driven to the other pole. The desire of union awakens the sense of distance and of guilt; the sin-offering is felt to be needed. But on this side it is still more out of man's power to consummate the sacrifice. For to this end the perfect innocence and sinlessness of the sacrificer is, in the very first place, necessary; but how can any *man* lay claim to this? and, if not for himself, how then for others,—for the family, or the nation? The consciousness of sin, of imperfection, of alienation, accompanies the worshipper even to the altar. He surrenders his most cherished possession, he invokes upon the head of the victim which stands in his place all that vengeance of God with which his conscience tells him his own head is threatened: he even, in his madness, offers the head of his beloved child as a sacrifice to the offended Deity. But still in the heart abides the feeling of God's anger: every misfortune, every pain, every bereavement, is to him a witness of this wrath, of this alienation. . . . . The great atonement, or *sin-offering*, of mankind was consummated by Christ, by means of his personal sacrifice: the great *thank-offering* of mankind became possible through Christ by means of the Spirit.'—*Bunsen*, pp. 6—10.

From these premises Mr. Bunsen thus draws his conclusion:—

'There can henceforth be no more human, and therefore typical, mediators between God and man; for *the* Mediator, the High Priest, is himself God: no more acts of mediation (sacrifices) can henceforth exist, as means of producing inward peace and satisfaction in the conscience, for the true sacrifice of atonement has once for all been offered, and the true sacrifice of thanksgiving is continually being offered.'—*Bunsen*, p. 11.

Dr. Arnold must be allowed to strike this point still more strongly, and for the purposes of the theory, more pertinently.

> 'Some there are who profess to join cordially in this doctrine, and ask who disputes it. So little do they understand the very tenets which they uphold! For they themselves dispute and deny it, inasmuch as they maintain that the sacraments are necessary to salvation, and that they can only be effectually administered by a man appointed after a certain form. And thus they set up again the human mediator, which is idolatry. . . . . This dogma, then, of a human priesthood in Christ's Church, appointed to administer His sacraments, and thereby to mediate between God and man, from no reasonable or moral necessity, is a thing quite distinct from any exaggerated notions of the activity of government: it is not the excess of a beneficent truth, but it is, from first to last, considering that it is addressed to Christians, who have their Divine Priest and Mediator already, a mere error: and an error not merely speculative, but fraught with all manner of mischief, idolatrous and demoralizing, destructive of Christ's Church; injurious to Christ and to his Spirit; the worst and earliest form of Antichrist.'—*Arnold*, p. 19.

This is the first, great, palmary argument of both these writers. The single, complete High Priesthood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ utterly abolishes and makes impossible any other Priesthood; and, inasmuch as Priesthood, in its full and true signification defined by themselves, means any sort of mediation whatever between God and man, every possible claim of mediation, even the claim of certain persons having alone the right of administering Sacraments necessary to salvation, falls under the same condemnation,—is corrupt, idolatrous, demoralizing and antichristian.

But secondly, the Priesthood of our Lord, admitting every single Christian, of whatever rank or profession of life, directly and immediately to the access and approach of God, involves the Priesthood of every individual Christian.

> 'Christianity first gave to man's moral responsibility its true position, first made it the central feeling of the individual, and caused it to be felt as the inseparable appendage of the awful gift of personality. Thus far then had every individual man become a priest of the Most High, because morally responsible to Him alone. Man's whole life, in intercourse with the world, as well as in the direct worship of God, was to be a continual sacrifice, to form a portion of the great work of the Spirit of love, by whose influences mankind is restored, and the kingdom of truth and righteousness founded and advanced. . . . . This is, according to our view, that priesthood which the apostle St. Peter ascribes to the whole Christian Church, a body of believers, under the designation of the true and elect Israel, when he says, "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people: that ye should show forth the praises of Him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light.'—(1 Pet. ii. 9.)—*Bunsen*, p. 13.

Such is the entire Scriptural argument, as far as Scripture is adduced for the affirmative proof, and establishment of their theory, of these two great Apostles of the Church of the Future.

Dr. Arnold does indeed in his 2d chapter allege eight or nine passages of the Acts and Epistles; but it is not in order to add any weight to his direct argument, but to relieve it from the pressure of the objections which those passages might seem to bring against it. Mr. Bunsen does also make a cursory reference to a few more passages, (one of which references contains a most adroit evasion of the force of an important place of the Old Testament, Exod. xix. 6, to which we shall refer again,) but the others are slight and unimportant, and not alleged in any strict or argumentative way.

There can, of course, be no doubt, that this Theory is as complete as it is simple. What can be plainer? In the times of old, before our Lord's coming, there might have been typical mediators, whose various efforts of sacrifice indicated the difficulty felt by man in becoming at peace with God; but the sacrifice once offered, all believers approach equally and with equal authority and right to God. Henceforth believers, not as a Church, not as one in Christ, not as a body, but separately and singly, are in absolute possession of the entire christian estate. Each is, so to speak, a corporation sole, a Church. Each is, in position, title, privilege, equal to all the rest. The Holy Scriptures, on which alone everything is founded, belong alike to all. None has a right to hold that his views of interpretation are better or sounder than those of another. None can be entitled to impart to others what those others may not impart to him.

The theory is simple indeed, as a Theory of the Constitution of the Church: so simple, that we cannot find out in what points it differs from the broadest *Independentism*.

Nor do we forget in saying this, that Mr. Bunsen expressly protests against Independentism, and says of it that it 'forgets 'time and hour, and looks even upon the present, the hard won 'inheritance of centuries, as having absolutely no real existence. In this despair, it is for beginning everything afresh, 'as if the past had yielded no experience, and formed no institutions, as if no Christian state existed—led away in this by 'American orators, who, like many others before them, make 'a virtue of necessity.' Mr. Bunsen's is a sort of Conservative-Independentism. He would graft a pure independentism of theory upon an existing condition of government and subordination. He would avail himself practically of the order and organization which result from the theory which he condemns, whilst he maintains a theory from which order and organization could never possibly result.

So simple indeed is this theory, that we venture to assert, and will undertake to prove, that, if it be admitted to be, as these writers claim, the entire constitutional Theory of the Church, there can be no Creed, there can be no Sacraments, there can be no spiritual Gift sufficiently ascertainable to be any ground of comfort to a believer, there can be no Unity, there can be no Church.

Government itself, as far as relates to religious matters, would seem, in spite of Dr. Arnold's elaborate argument on the subject, to be simple tyranny; and so, we conclude, must Mr. Bunsen think when he says that 'a free constitution *in the widest sense* '*of the words*, is the condition of the realization and effectual 'exercise of the true priesthood in the Church, and of the 'preservation of the Church herself.'[1] Indeed, we hardly see why separate Christians are not kings, as well as priests, so as to render it as great an usurpation in the King of Prussia or the Queen of England to assume royal authority over their subjects, as for the Archbishop of Canterbury, or the Bishop of London, to claim the Priesthood (on principle and catholically) over their Dioceses.

The following are the '*summa fastigia*' of Dr. Arnold's argument in favour of *government* in the Church of the Future.

> 'It is seen and generally acknowledged that men's physical welfare has been greatly promoted by the co-operation of a number of persons endowed with unlike powers and resources.'
>
> 'This co-operative principle was by Christianity to be applied to moral purposes, as it had long been to physical.'
>
> 'The object of Christian society relating to the improvement of the whole of our life, the natural and fit state of the Church is that it should be a sovereign society or commonwealth.'
>
> 'So long as the sovereign society is not Christian, and the Church is not sovereign, we have two powers alike designed to act upon the whole of our being, but acting often in opposition to one another. Of these powers, the one has wisdom, the other external force and influence.'
>
> 'The natural and true state of things then is, that this power and this wisdom should be united.'
>
> 'This is the perfect notion of a Christian Church.'—*Arnold*, pp. 6—10.

All this sounds very plausible and easy; not less plausible and easy than Cicero's famous notion of the origin of states, when the 'noble savage' was won by the eloquence of orators to relinquish barbarian life, to build cities, and submit to civilization; but how, we should like to ask, is the mass of Christians, all of equal right and privilege, all of equal claim to possess and interpret Scripture, all of equal right to hold, to think, to believe, to worship according to their separate royalty and priesthood, ever to be brought to this voluntary co-operation, in the force and strength of which they will be willing to obey, or able to enforce their joint decrees? And how will such joint decrees escape the charge of tyrannical interference with their said separate royalties and priesthoods, if they claim to overrule the free choice in point of belief, or worship, or anything that is religious (which are the sole objects of the co-operation), of those who have as good right and title as their governors?

---

[1] Bunsen, p. 18.

Also how comes this mass of separate kings and priests to be able to be spoken of as '*the Church?*' We must, of course, suppose all the present bonds of union loosened—parishes, dioceses, the whole of the higher spiritual doctrines of the Sacraments abandoned, Christians assembled in separate Independent congregations, or broken up into still minuter subdivisions,—how, we ask, can it be imagined that we can call such a loose, scattered, disjointed, infusible mass, as this would be, *the Church*, and proceed to argue about it as if it were capable of sovereign power?

Again, if it were capable of power (which we deny), or being capable of it were able to exercise it without tyranny (which we deny again), or, being capable of exercising it justly, could exercise it without falling to pieces again, and at once, at the very first exercise of it (which we deny again),—how, we ask, could a democratic spiritual constitution like this combine in one with any secular constitution which the world knows, excepting a democracy?[1] And how could it conceivably hold its own, even with a democracy, while the secular and spiritual objects would needs be so diverse, the leaders of the respective powers so different, the struggles so tumultuous, and the powers of coercion so small? We know, indeed, that Dr. Arnold protests againt all distinction of things into secular and spiritual, and tells us that such a distinction is 'utterly without foundation, 'for in one sense all things are secular, for they are done in 'time and on earth; in another, all things are spiritual, for they 'affect us morally either for the better or the worse, and so 'tend to make our spirits fitter for the society of God, or of his 'enemies.' But we really must, with all respect for the lamented writer, claim to regard this sort of writing as extravagant, and indicative only of the zeal and heat of the author, and his intense conviction of the soundness of his conclusions; for can it be denied that some things are *more secular* than others, and some *more spiritual?* that though, no doubt, there is no absolute barrier between the two subjects, as though the secular were not at all spiritual, or the spiritual not at all secular, yet that going to church and saying one's prayers verges more nearly to the spiritual side than eating one's breakfast, and *vice versâ*?

---

[1] It is interesting and curious to observe, how while the high Roman monarchical theory of Church government is apparently incompatible with all polities except such as are monarchical; and the Independent with all except such as are democratic; the Federal-Episcopal, or Cyprianic seems capable of an application as wide as that of Christianity itself.

From Government let us pass to *Doctrine*. We hold it to be equally impossible that this constitution of the Church of the Future should admit of a Creed.

This impossibility seems to us to arise directly, and follow necessarily, from the perfect independence of interpretation of Holy Scripture belonging to every believer.

Nor let it be supposed that unity of theological opinion would be as likely to be maintained as unity of political, or of scientific, or other sorts of opinion, without the intervention of any sort of authority, by the mere gravitation of the sentiments of the majority towards some common principles, of which none but paradoxical and exceptional minds could doubt. Such may well be the case in subjects where opinions are either derived by process of acknowledged reasoning from some acknowledged principles, or are capable of being tested continually by their application to the actual state of things. But the interpretation of Holy Scripture is unlike either of these. No principles of interpretation of these books can be laid down, or ever have been laid down, on which all will agree. No dogmas ever have been, or can be derived from those books, which multitudes have not denied. No single truth, moral or divine, with the exception of the mere being of God, can boast to have been drawn from Holy Scripture with the unanimous consent of all who have called themselves Christians—of all who would have a right to claim, not a vote only, but an equality of rightness, truth, and privilege, according to the Bunsenian Constitution of the Future Church.

Accordingly we find in these writers a very consistent laxity on the subject of creeds. Dr. Arnold's work, being a fragment, does not reach any formal discussion of the subject of doctrine. Yet we find him saying, in a tone which well indicates the manner in which he would have treated that subject, if he had dealt with it directly,—

> 'A great point is gained when we understand that the heresies condemned by the Apostles were not mere erroneous opinions on some theoretical truth, but absolute perversions of Christian holiness: that they were not so much false as wicked. And further, where there was a false opinion in the heresy, it was of so monstrous a character, and so directly connected with profligacy of life, that it admits of no comparison with the *so-called heresies of later ages. . . . In the Arian controversy, and in all others which have since* arisen among Christians, the question has turned upon the true interpretation of the Apostles' words; but both parties have alike acknowledged that what the Apostles taught was to be received as the undoubted rule of faith and of action. Not so, however, the *real heretics* of the first century.'—*Arnold*, p. 89.

Is it possible to draw any other conclusion from this passage than that, in the author's mind, there can be no heresy[1] in those who acknowledge that what the Apostles taught is to be received as the undoubted rule of faith and action?—*i.e.* that Scriptural interpretation is an absolutely open field, in which as there can be no heresy, so there can be no authoritative truth?

Mr. Bunsen has two methods of dealing with Christian doctrine. The one philosophical; the norm of which may be gathered from the following sentence:—

> 'It can never be repeated too often, or expressed too emphatically, that the Protestant Church, by regarding piety and morality as identical terms, by assuming the religious and moral feelings of man to be inseparably united in their deepest roots, has bound herself to discover and demonstrate the *ethical exponent* of every *objective expression* respecting the relation of man to God.'—*Bunsen*, p. 33.

Does any reader desire a few specimens of the art of *ethical exposition of objective doctrines?* Here are a few with which this volume casually furnishes us. The Church of Christ; 'Emancipated Humanity,' (p. 224). Catholicity; 'Believing Humanity as one in its Divine Redeemer,' (p. 216). Catholic and Apostolic Church of Christ; 'Humanity set free by the Word and the Spirit,' (p. 192). Universal Priesthood of Christians; 'The general moral responsibility to God of every individual,' (p. 32), or, *aliter*, 'the postulate that faith in the Holy Spirit is capable of being realized,' (p. 21). Episcopacy; 'The personal Conscience,' (p. 69). The kingdom of God; 'The moral order of the world,' (p. 35). The body of Christ; 'Humanity adopted into the Divine fellowship,' (217).

We should have thought that there would have been little need of any further doctoring of doctrine than this philosophical method would have furnished. Reduced to such a gaseous form, sublimed and bubble-blown into next to nothing, expounded thus ethically into nothing more nor less than our own separate selves, with our own personal notions and moralities, doctrine is rendered so completely harmless, that we cannot understand why it is worth while, even if it be not inconsistent and unintelligible, to make a separate historical crusade against doctrine as such.

---

[1] How broadly and clearly Dr. Arnold held this opinion is plain from a remarkable letter in his Correspondence (Letter cxxxvi.), in which he says,—'The differences between Christian and Christian are not moral differences, except accidentally; and that is what I meant in that passage in the Church Reform Pamphlet which you, in common with many others, have taken in a sense which I should wholly disclaim. An Unitarian, as such, is a Christian; that is, if a man follows Christ's law, and believes his words, according to his conscientious sense of their meaning, he is a Christian; and though I may think he understands Christ's words amiss, yet that is a question of interpretation, and no more: the purpose of his heart and mind is to obey and be guided by Christ, and therefore he is a Christian. But I believe—if I err as to the matter-of-fact, I shall greatly rejoice—that Unitarianism happens to contain many persons who are only Unitarians negatively, as not being Trinitarians; and I question whether these follow Christ with enough of sincerity and obedience to entitle them to be called Christians.' This last sentence appears to us to be extremely remarkable, whether it be considered in respect of logic, candour, or charity.

But Mr. Bunsen is not satisfied. He complains that the Protestant Churches, for the last three hundred years, have taken up the same one-sided view as the Clergy of the earlier Church for a thousand (fifteen hundred?) years before;—the 'notion, that is, that Christianity is in the very first place a '*doctrine*, and that unity of doctrine, that is, of a theological 'system, is the condition of the development of the Church in 'every other respect.'—*Bunsen*, p. 19.

Thus, then, we might suppose, that what with philosophy, what with anti-dogmatism, and what with the independent right of kings and priests to interpret, Mr. Bunsen had swept away all creeds whatsoever, and left the field as clear of doctrine as we have seen it made of government. But no: we must not do injustice. The very same paragraph from which we have extracted the last sentence contains the very thing which we had imagined to be annihilated—to be impossible—to have become an absurdity;—the *Symbolum Bunsenianum* itself.

> 'The eternal, indestructible foundation and object of Christian faith is formed by three acts of God himself:—the act of creation, by which the world was called into existence, and man made in the image of God; the act of redemption, through Christ the God-man; and the act of the outpouring of the Holy Ghost to be the Guide of the mind of the Church, and the supreme Witness for that which is testified to us by history'—(1 John v.)—*Bunsen*, p. 18.

We trust that our readers will give us credit for the self-command with which we waive all more particular notice of the audacity and presumption with which this 'Apostle of the Church of the Future' takes upon him to shear away from the glorious and venerable creed of the true Apostles, every word (such as 'Father,' 'only-begotten Son,' 'our Lord,' &c.) which contains *truth* in contradistinction to *act*, so as to enable him, with the least semblance of consistency to retain some shadow of an objective religion at the very time when his arguments have seemed to sweep away all doctrines whatever from the Church. But we really must ask, what right has Mr. Bunsen, after all his arguments, to use in his creed the words God-man? What possible warrant can he have, in defiance of all Church history, to disallow the existence of Arian, Unitarian, and Socinian opinions, by introducing the *doctrine* of the Divinity of our Lord into his miserable creed of Divine Acts? Why has not the Arian, whom, as we have seen, Dr. Arnold will not allow to be called a heretic, because he differs from the Church in interpretation only, being a king and a priest, as good a right to his opinion, and as good a right to be true in holding it, as Mr. Bunsen himself? To ourselves, the inconsistency involved in this introduction of doctrine, properly so called, into the objective creed of the Church of the Future, and the consequent exclusion of Arians and Socinians from the fellowship of so comprehensive a multitude, is perfectly incomprehensible,—perfectly incomprehensible on every principle save one, and that one which we doubt whether the writer will admit,—namely, that he is a better Christian than logician;—that his instinctive reverence for Christian truth shudders and recoils from the faithful application of his own principle, and that he cannot bear his own necessary and most miserable conclusion.

From Doctrine we must proceed to Ordinances. It appears to us to be perfectly impossible that 'the Church of the Future' can retain Sacraments, as rites, in any real manner conferring supernatural gifts. It may, no doubt, have a thing which it may call Baptism, which it may administer as the initiation of a heathen into Independent Christianity; and it may dignify some religious meal with the sacred name of the Holy Communion, but Sacraments, in the sense in which the Church has always understood them, Sacraments in which outward and visible signs are the means and the pledge of inward and spiritual graces, it cannot have.

Nor do they claim them. In Dr. Arnold's book are various scattered sayings about Baptism and the Lord's Supper, which plainly show what sort of things they are in the mind of an apostle of the free Church of the Future.

> 'The repentance and faith of the person baptized, through God's mercy in Christ, saves him. . . . . The whole importance of Baptism, in his (S. Barnabas's) eyes, must have consisted in the real change of heart which it implied, and the change of heart of which it was the beginning; and the ceremony of baptizing with water was merely a symbol of the great and important change which a man underwent in passing from a state of heathenism to Christianity. . . . . God's grace is conveyed to men' (in the so-called Sacraments), 'morally, because the joining of Christ's Church in the first instance, and the constantly refreshing our communion with it afterwards, are actions highly beneficial to our moral nature. . . . . . Christians have been baptized with water, as an introduction into Christ's service.'—Pp. 53, 62, 63, 78.

The following are some of the expressions of the same writer respecting the other Sacrament:—

> 'When Christians met together and received the bread and wine of their common living as the body and blood of Christ, such an act had a real tendency to strengthen and confirm their souls, and the Holy Spirit made such

a communion a constant means of grace to those who partook of it. . . The bread and wine became the Sacrament of Christ's body and blood, according to Christ's ordinance, by the assembled Church receiving them as such; by their converting an act of nature into an act of religion; by their agreeing to partake together as of their earthly food, so also of their spiritual, and thus being joined to one another in Christ. The agreement, therefore, of thus communicating, their common faith and love constitute the real consecration of the bread and wine: it is this, which, through Christ's Spirit, changes the Supper into the Sacrament. . . . . He commanded us to eat, *as it were*, his flesh. . . . . The communion was intended to keep in memory the death of our Lord, and through our memory to strengthen our faith, and so to make us actually and personally partakers in the benefits of his death.'—Pp. 20, 21, 77, 97.

Now let us not be misunderstood. We readily acknowledge that several of the expressions which we have quoted may be innocently and rightly used;—innocently and rightly used, that is, by those who have elsewhere acknowledged the deeper and truer doctrine of the Sacraments: but when they are given as *the* doctrine, the whole, the contradistinguished doctrine, then we say confidently that the scheme to which they belong contains no Sacraments at all, no Sacraments in the sense of the Catholic Church, no Sacraments in the sense of the Church of England, no Sacraments in such sense as can give to individuals in the Church any comfortable hope of their possessing any Divine, spiritual, supernatural gift.

It is not our intention to enter into discussion of the Christian Sacraments with these writers. We desire to confine ourselves to this single point, that such Sacraments as they teach, being not the *means whereby we receive spiritual grace*, are, by consequence, *no pledge to assure us of our having received it.*—These Catholic *means* being annulled, and none, that is, none which are visible, being substituted in their place, there can be no pledge at all, for the very essence of a pledge is to be visible and ascertainable. Means, then, of grace, that is, voluntary, practicable means, such as men may avail themselves of, and such as God hath promised to accompany with his vital, life giving grace, being annulled,—and pledges, that is, visible ascertainable proofs, guarantees of our having received what is invisible and not ascertainable, being done away likewise,—*at least*, all assurance and comfort of supernatural gift is destroyed also. For no man can, on this system, do battle against the smallest real inward doubt which rises in his mind. As long, indeed, as a man has no doubts, of course he may believe anything,—whether true or false, real or absurd,—and so, he may believe himself to be born again of the Holy Ghost, to be a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven. But, when doubt comes; when sin comes, engendering doubt; or when gainsayers come; how is he then to maintain, or to prove, or to comfort himself in the assurance of these *supernatural* gifts? How shall a man be *naturally* convinced that he possesses that which is *supernatural?*

Shall we be told that the blessing depends on faith, and that a man *can* ascertain his own faith?—We reply that it is impossible: impossible, that is, in the times when the proof and guarantee are most needed, the times of self-accusation, uneasiness, and doubtfulness.

We do not add a hundred other considerations which crowd into our mind,—the miserable uncertainty as to the *degree* of undoubtingness requisite to win the blessing,—the miserable uncertainty as to whether a man is deceived or no,—the miserable uncertainty as to the purity of the motives under which we are endeavouring to believe,—the miserable uncertainty as to the extent to which subsequent sin may have interrupted, or prevented the supernatural influences,—the miserable mischief of making men's hopes and comforts, and with them their cheerful daily duty and worship depend on a perpetual self-dissection, a continual laying bare of the inward workings of their own minds,—a daily feeling of the pulse, as it were, of the heart's faith, all hope and happiness being ready to despair and die the instant that pulse should seem to fail under the finger, while no love, nor faith, nor feeling can help dying under such melancholy and unnatural culture;—we do not enlarge on all these and innumerable other such like considerations, but we merely insist, that if the workings of our own minds, wherein supernatural movements are not capable of being distinguished from natural ones, are to be appealed to as the pledge of our possessing supernatural gifts, that this is merely a round-about way of dismissing supernatural gifts from this scheme of religion altogether. Supernatural gifts, undistinguishable from natural, are, to us, not other than natural. Supernatural gifts, not exhibiting themselves in supernatural powers, and yet not divinely attached to external ordinance as to a divine means and pledge of their being imparted, are not distinguishable from natural. Therefore, it appears to us demonstrable, that he who does away with the Catholic character of the Sacraments, the character whereby they are the sure means, and unfailing pledge of Divine invisible grace, does necessarily demolish everything that is supernatural in Christianity. He may talk of the Holy Spirit, of the new birth, of all the high spiritual mysteries belonging to Christian religion, but it can only be words, opinions, fancies. A gift, determined to himself, capable of being appealed to in times of trial, pledged, and real,—a gift capable of being a happiness and comfort in the days when the heart feels no strength, and is ready, as far as its inner feelings go, to sink into the depths of despair, he cannot feel that he has. When faith or certainty is the only ground of comfort, uneasiness and doubt must needs be despair and misery. It appears to be demonstrable that in these distant ages and countries, when supernatural gifts no longer manifest themselves in supernatural powers, the belief in outward ordinances as the visible means and pledge of supernatural grace, and in a succession of men from the apostles authorized to administer such ordinances, are absolutely essential to the belief in supernatural graces themselves; and by consequence that the Priesthood and Sacraments are the only security against a system not always of intentional, but always of pure and essential naturalism.[1]

We are distressed to find a writer like Dr. Arnold urging against the Catholic doctrine such (must we not call them?) vulgar objections as that we cannot be saved by 'the outward rite of immersion in water,' that 'it is not rationalism, but reason resting on faith, which assures us of the utter incapability of any outward bodily action to produce in us an inward spiritual effect.' Against whom could he suppose that he was writing? Who ever dreamed of attributing to the outward rite of immersion, or any outward bodily action, any proper power at all upon the soul of man, or of doubting the justice of the poet's sentiment—

'O! faciles animi qui tristia crimina cædis
Tolli fluminеâ posse putetis aquâ!'

But where is the impossibility of *His* attaching spiritual blessings to outward ordinances who bade the blind man go and wash in the pool of Siloam and return seeing,—that is to say, who by His divine power gave efficacy to means naturally most inadequate, in the cure of bodily ailments? Is it not mere childishness (not to say more) to ask, as Dr. Arnold does against Hooker in respect of this very instance, 'Is it in the slightest degree a parallel case, that because a bodily application was *prescribed as a cure for a bodily disease* (!), it should therefore cure a disease of the soul?' Where is the unlikelihood of His attaching spiritual blessings to outward ordinances, who desired that His people should have peace in believing in every age? No doubt the washing in Siloam will not prove, of its own proper logical force, the sacramental efficacy of Holy Baptism, but, no doubt also, when that efficacy has its sufficient proof elsewhere, this divine act may rationally, logically, and forcibly be quoted in illustration and support of it, and in the overthrow and silencing of its gainsayers.

---

[1] From the correspondence (vol. ii. pp. 141, 169, 256), it appears that Dr. Arnold and the Chevalier Bunsen were not entirely agreed about the Sacraments. The points of difference are not made clear, but it would seem the views of Mr. Bunsen were higher than those of his friend.

But it is necessary to draw this portion of our remarks to a close, and therefore we shall add no more in proof of our position that the constitution of the Church of the Future, as laid down by these two authors, admits not of government, or doctrine, or ordinances, or supernatural gifts, or unity, or peace, or any Church.

But before we conclude, it is necessary, in all candour, to deal with the Theory in a more direct manner. Adding no more as to its own inherent defects, we must in all propriety add a few observations in reply to it, as an attack upon the Catholic Theory.

No Catholic Christian would think of denying or doubting the truth of the two great doctrines which, as we have explained above, form the entire Church Theory of these writers: the one, the Single Priesthood, and by consequence, the single Sacrifice of our blessed Lord;—the other, the consequent Priesthood, so to call it, that is, the unimpeded access to God of every believer.

We not only do not deny, nor doubt these truths, but we vindicate and maintain them as truths of the most vital and deep importance; and also as truths which the Catholic Church has always vindicated and maintained with the utmost vigilance and care.

But these writers think that these two truths, of their own simple force and power, do at once and of necessity destroy and render impossible the Christian Priesthood and its offices.

With the whole Catholic Church of Christ, from the day of the Resurrection, we utterly deny the inference. We hold the two truths not less firmly than the apostles of the Church of the Future; we utterly repudiate, and will undertake to disprove the force of the conclusion.

We must take them separately.

Does the single Priesthood of Christ make all priesthood of men, that is, all special appointments of men to do acts necessary to the souls of other men, impossible, antichristian, and idolatrous?

Surely, no. For in the first place, why should it? If the claimed Priesthood of men be given in order to enable them to do *other things*, different from those which the Single Priest has done singly, and once for all, the supposed incompatibility of the two Priesthoods seems to disappear at once.—Granted, that the Sacrifice of our blessed Lord is the single and only proper meritorious sacrifice, and He the single and only Priest who could make atonement to God for man, how does this great truth disprove the possibility of His entrusting to His apostles, and a succession of persons after them, the peculiar office of administering the outward rites to which Regeneration and the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ may be, by the covenanted mercy of God, attached? We cannot see the *elenchus.* We cannot find it. *There is none,* except it be drawn (as these writers draw it) from an ingenious *definition* of Priesthood, which, not confining it to the sense in which our Lord is the single Priest, but making it comprehend all possible intervention of means between man and God, then proceeds, easily enough, to disprove a particular sort of intervention.

But not only does the fact of the Single Priesthood of Christ fail to demonstrate from its own proper logical force and cogency, the modified and subordinate Priesthood of men, but also there are facts in the history of God's dealings with His people which seem to show plainly that some interventions between the soul of man and God have been possible and permissible without any such idolatrous and antichristian result.

In the first place (and for this argument we are indebted to the vigorous pages of Mr. Barter[1]) St. Paul did, on repeated occasions, recognise the Jewish Priesthood and sacrifices, subsequently to his conversion, as the other Apostles did also by their continual attendance at the Temple worship, and by their conduct recorded in the Acts xxi. 24. Now we do not wish to press this point too far, nor to enter into the various encumbering considerations by which it is surrounded; but thus much seems to us to be clear and undeniable; that it cannot be, *ipso facto,* idolatrous and unchristian to think of such a thing as a priest, or an intervening party between the worshipper and God, subsequently to the Crucifixion, without involving S. Paul, and the other Apostles, in such heinous guilt.

Will it be said that this was merely the dying out of old types, the old prophetic ritual almost gone, and, although in actual date it outlived the fulfilment, still rightly to be regarded as typical and prophetic '*ex parte post*'?

We doubt whether our opponents would gain anything,—whether they would not rather lose much by such a view. For not only does the cogency of our last conclusion remain undiminished, but if a typical priesthood might last for a few years after the Crucifixion without guilt, we cannot see why other subordinate priesthoods might not continue throughout the whole Church's history. Are not commemorations after an event somewhat akin to types before it? May not a Priesthood of Commemorations be analogous to a Priesthood of Types? Do our opponents acknowledge the true Priesthood of the

---

[1] 'The Gainsaying of Core,' by the Rev. W. B. Barter.

Jewish Priests? But how do they reconcile it with the doctrine of Rev. xiii. 8, of 'the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world?' There never was, or could be, more than One real, true Priest. This is He who hath an unchangeable Priesthood, who offered Himself before the foundation of the world, in the faith of whom the ancient Patriarchs lived and died. But if the Jewish Priesthood of Types be compatible[1] with this Single Omni-temporal Priesthood, and if the continuance of this Priesthood of Types for a few years even after this Priesthood had become visible, had taken place and position in the chronology and geography of the world, and had consummated the Sacrifice upon the Hill of Calvary, be not incompatible with it either,—then we think that all ground of reason and show of argument is cut away from those who presume to say that the Single Priesthood of Christ renders idolatrous and antichristian every possible intervention of appointed men in the intercourse of other men's souls with God.

The question of priesthood, then, becomes a question, not of reason, but of fact. Into *that* question we have not present occasion to enter. We will only observe respecting it, that it appears to us beyond measure surprising that, in investigating an historical question of fact, such as this, two such able and experienced historians should deliberately overlook the evidence of *institutions* (such as Church polities and liturgies), of institutions, so long maintained, so difficult to alter, so well supplying the scanty and imperfect, and sometimes contradictory testimony of books, and content themselves with a theory built on *à priori* grounds, and, by means of many a painful and paradoxical interpretation, exhibited as *not contrary* to the few and scattered relics of the first age.

But it is also said, that the complete Priesthood of every believer, that is, the full and free access to God, purchased for every single Christian by the sacrifice of Christ, is equally destructive of the claim of Priesthood on the part of any separate class.

1. Surely, in the first place, there is no necessary reason whatever why, whilst general approach and access to God, as in confession and prayer, may be freely and *directly* granted to all, certain particular blessings may be imparted to them *indirectly*, that is, through the agency of others. There is, as we say, not only no necessary reason why it should not be so, but every reason of analogy, both in the natural and earlier revealed doings of God with man why it should.

---

[1] Sacerdotium Leviticum—habebat imaginem, non veritatem, futuri cujusdam Sacerdotis.—S. August. Enarr. in Ps. xxxvi. 2.

2. Secondly, if there be, in Christian religion, *ordinances*, conferring supernatural graces, it appears to us to be necessary that there should be persons to administer them, and those, inheritors by direct descent of those to whom the power was originally imparted by the hand of the Apostles. If it were otherwise, no persons could have adequate security of their possessing the invisible graces, or be able to comfort themselves in the times of uneasiness and doubt. We anticipate here the objection which may be thought to rise from the difficult question of 'lay baptism.' But, in fact, there is no real weight in such an objection, partly because the Church never held the full validity of lay, or heretical baptism, *without confirmation*, and partly because the question of lay baptism owed all its difficulty to the fact that baptism, from its essential nature, does not admit of repetition. So little ground does there seem to be for an offhand saying of Dr. Arnold, in his correspondence, 'Lay baptism 'was allowed by Hooker to be valid, and no distinction can be 'drawn between one Sacrament and the other. (Corresp. ii. 53.)

3. Thirdly, the example of the Jewish people bears directly upon the case, and with a force, when all the points of it are considered, which seems to us irresistible. In the third month, 'when the children of Israel were gone forth out of the land of 'Egypt, the same day came they into the wilderness of Sinai, and 'there Israel camped before the mount. And Moses went up 'unto God, and the Lord called unto him, out of the mountain, saying, 'Thus shalt thou say to the house of Jacob, and tell the 'children of Israel, Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, 'and how I bore you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto 'myself. Now, therefore, if ye will obey my voice, indeed, and 'keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me 'above all people, for all the earth is mine; and ye shall be 'unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation. These are 'the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel.' Now here we have the very same thing said of the children of Israel, which S. Peter, referring to this very passage, says afterwards of Christians, which saying forms the Scriptural groundwork of the constitution of the Church of the Future. Mr. Bunsen, with great adroitness, slurs the difficulty over; for having quoted the place of S. Peter, he thus proceeds. 'In 'this was accomplished that promise which God made to the Jews 'by his servant Moses, to be to them a light along that dark 'path of law and legalism which they were so long to pursue: 'And ye shall be to me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation.' (Exod. xix. 6.)

But what possible ground of reason can Mr. Bunsen adduce for interpreting these words so exclusively prophetically as to deny their obvious application, in the first place, to the children of Israel themselves? Granting that their full meaning did not come out, until believers, by being made members of Christ in Holy Baptism, became, in a new and full sense, 'a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation;' how can we grant, in defiance, we believe, of all expositors, in defiance of the obvious sense of the words spoken so solemnly, so publicly, so early,—at the very inauguration of the Jewish nation,—in defiance of the plain interpretation of the Jews themselves, that they do not apply to the children of Israel, at least in a primary and inchoate manner, before the days of the Messiah?

Did not the children of Israel so interpret them? What then was the meaning of Korah the Levite, and Dathan and Abiram, 'the Reubenites, when they rose up before Moses, with certain 'of the children of Israel, two hundred and fifty princes of the 'assembly, famous in the congregation, men of renown, and 'gathered themselves together against Moses and against Aaron, 'and said unto them, Ye take too much upon you, *seeing all the 'congregation are holy, every one of them*, and the Lord is among 'them, wherefore then lift ye up yourselves above the congrega'tion of the Lord?' (Numbers xvi.) They had recently heard the solemn declaration made by God through Moses: they knew the promise of God to make them a kingdom of priests and a holy nation, and so they banded, Levites and Reubenites, with men apparently of various tribes, to denounce what they esteemed an usurping priesthood, that presumed to come between them and God; who, by speaking to them as He had done, and being among them, had given them the blessing of direct approach, and given them each his separate and royal priesthood. Korah[1], Dathan, and Abiram, were undoubtedly right in their premise. The congregation *was* holy, and the Lord *was* among them; but they were wrong and rebellious in their inference. The holiness and priesthood of the congregation did not, of their own proper logical power and force, disprove the peculiar office and priesthood of Aaron and his sons. And so we fear it may be now. The apostles of the Church of the Future are right in their premise. Christians *are* priests and kings, as members of Christ. But is there no fear of their incurring the danger of the gainsaying of Core, if they draw Core's inference? No fear of tempting Christ by dishonouring Him in His priests?

For be it observed that S. Peter's warning against the gainsaying of Core would be an idle and useless warning, if such sin could not be committed in Christian days; and it could not be committed, if the universal priesthood did really put every member of the Christian Church into precisely the same position of spiritual privilege and office.

---

[1] A strange use of the instance of Korah, the Levite, will be found made in Vol. ii. p. 104 of Dr. Arnold's Correspondence.

The same observation may be extended to S. Paul's lesson in the 10th Chapter of the 1st of Corinthians. The history of the Jews in the wilderness was written for our example, on whom the ends of the world are come. Every act of disobedience and lawlessness of theirs was recorded, because Christians are tempted to the like; they are all recorded to the intent that we should, by their example, refrain from sin—*the* five great sins in the Christian Church; luxury, idolatry, fornication, tempting Christ, and murmuring—which last, though it may not exclude the continual murmurings of the people, as for water, does undoubtedly include, and that in a primary and especial manner, the murmuring of the great Levites and Reubenites against the Aaronic priesthood.

But are we to conclude that there is really no difficulty in the Catholic theory in the points on which these writers appear to us to have made so miserable wreck? Is it obvious and clear at the first sight, how the full and true Priesthood and Royalty of single believers, is compatible with the claimed Priesthood and power in the Church of the successors of the Apostles? Unquestionably not: and we think that we should not adequately conclude this hasty sketch of the argument whereby we believe these gainsayers to be really answered, if we did not freely acknowledge the difficulty, and offer what we believe to be the Catholic solution of it.

The Apostles, in whom all the original powers and privileges of the Church were vested, held, as is plain, two characters. They are partly representatives of the Church, and partly its rulers: that is, some of the things said to them were said to them as to the Church at large, and so to all and every member of the Church, and some more personally, as to those by whom the Church, when it came to consist of more members, was to be governed. The difficulty arises from the difficulty of discriminating between these different sayings.

This very difficulty, we conceive to have been urged by the apostle S. Peter to the Lord himself, when, after the parable of the servants watching for their lord when he should return from the wedding, he asks 'Lord, speakest thou this parable unto 'us, or even unto all?'[1] In our Lord's answer he appears to acknowledge plainly that the preceding parable was spoken with an application to the Apostles as governors or stewards of the Church. 'And the Lord said, who then is that faithful 'and wise steward whom his lord shall make ruler over his

---

[1] S. Luke xii. 41.

'household, to give them their portion of meat in due season? 'Blessed is that servant, whom his lord when he cometh shall 'find so doing. Of a truth I say unto you that he will make 'him ruler over all that he hath.'

Here then we find not only that there are to be rulers and stewards of God's Church during the time of the Lord's absence, and they, entrusted with power to judge of the seasons in which spiritual meat should be apportioned to his people, but what is still more remarkable, that this authority is not to cease when the Lord returns to establish his triumphant kingdom. The steward who has discharged his office well in the temporary state, shall be ruler over all that his Lord hath in the eternal. This promise of *power* as one of the characteristic blessings of the state of the saints in heaven, is remarkably illustrated by various other passages, such as S. Matthew xxiv. 47; xxv. 21, 23, 24; xix. 28; S. Luke xix. 17, 19; 1 Cor. vi. 2, 3; &c.

Now all that we wish to conclude from this passage is this; that although by the admission of individuals into the Body of Christ, they do really become, each one of them, partakers of all the glorious privileges which belong to that estate, and among the rest of these privileges that of Royalty, as Christ is Royal, and the only King (according to the teaching of S. Peter, in the passage we have already often referred to, and Rev. i. 6, and v. 10), yet that Royalty is entirely compatible with the existence of authority of various kinds, and among others, such as we specifically call royal authority among them.

Nor compatible only: it actually requires (and that not temporarily, and for mere cohesion's sake, for thus much of needful authority, as a human necessity, Dr. Arnold grants) subordination and superiority, and with these, obedience, and authoritativeness on the part of the individuals who hold this lofty position.

For the individuals are kings, not as separately created, independent potentates, but inasmuch, and so far forth, as they are One in Christ the King. It is the One in Christ that is the King. It is the unity that is royal. They are the separate atoms which compose the unity. Kings, indeed, they are, as the separate atoms of the royal unity. But the instant that they try to dissever, and maintain apart their single royalties from that of the unity in which alone they reign, they do, ipso facto, break the unity, and breaking it lose the very claim they make. As then the Body is one, and has many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body, so also is Christ. Theirs is no voluntary association of independent powers; no alliance for mutual security, or advantage of separate or separable estates; no natural or reasonable conjunction, such as Dr. Arnold argues for, of 'corporations sole' for purposes of more extended good or benefit. On the contrary, their individual powers depend absolutely on the collective power, and exist only therein: without it they are rebels, Dathans, Korahs; within it, they are kings in the royal unity which is Christ, and whereof Christ is the Head.

Now it does not in any degree interfere with this view to believe that the Lord (when leaving the world in the flesh, He began to be present with His Church in His Spirit), should have left a *succession* of persons to exercise these authorities in His Church until the end of the world. We do not say (speaking for the present of the royalty alone,) that a succession is, à priori, the only possible way by which the requisite authority might have been obtained, nor that it would have been impossible (had such been the Divine will), for the Royal Body to have evolved, in each generation, from itself the powers requisite for its own government; nor, again, for the Royal Body (supposing the Divine succession by any circumstance, or accident, broken or interrupted,) to begin a fresh succession, either absolutely, or in isolated portions of the world. We do not say this; but we say that there is nothing whatever in the view of a perpetual *succession* of these powers within the Church to add any new difficulty to the theory of the united royalty of the Church, participated by every individual Christian.

As the real royalty of many individual Christians forms no argument against the real single royalty of the Church, One in Christ; and as the real single royalty of the Church, One in Christ, involves the necessary consequence of authority exercised over those who are truly kings; so this authority may, for any reason that can be adduced to the contrary, be determined to a series or succession of persons within the Church, selected each by their predecessor, and invested, according to the ordinance of God, with the peculiar authorities requisite to enable them to discharge their office.

What the nature of those peculiar authorities will be, it is, perhaps, difficult to state, in the à priori manner in which we are now arguing. But we may safely say that they will comprise at least the following particulars; authority of admission and of expulsion; *i. e.* authority of making, and deposing individual royalties;—authority of correction and punishment, these being the necessary forerunners and preparations of expulsion;—authority of guiding and teaching;—of defending, strengthening, and supporting, in all ways in which they may need it, the separate and single royalties, by bringing to bear on them the discretion, strength, and weight of the collective royalty acting in its chief officers.

We may appear to have been wasting effort and argument here on an acknowledged point. '*Quis dubitavit?*' we can readily suppose, may be asked by those who agree with Dr. Arnold's views, and remember how carefully he maintains the necessity of organization and government in every human society, and by consequence in the Church.

We do not, indeed, think that our argument is quite identical with Dr. Arnold's, even as far as we have yet conducted it; for on his view, government is a natural need, voluntarily submitted to by the separate independent regalities, for the purpose of obtaining certain further advantages than they can gain singly,—in ours it is an essential, original, divine portion of the Christian scheme, not destined to terminate with this life, out of which, and because of which, there descends to individuals all that separate character and privilege of royalty of which the Apostle speaks.

But our main object in putting forward *first* the single subject of the royalty of Christians is, that from it we may proceed to the parallel and more controverted subject of their priesthood. For in all the passages (Exod. xix.; 1 S. Peter ii.; Rev. i. and v.) in which the royalty of Christians is spoken of, their priesthood is spoken of too; nor can we see anything in the one subject which should render the views inapplicable to it which are applicable to the other.

For, in the first place, Christians derive their priesthood as they derive their royalty, solely from being one in Christ. He is the true single priest: priest and victim: at once the lamb slain from the foundation of the world, and the only omnitemporal priest. There never was, nor could be, true victim but he; there never was, nor could be, true priest but he. But his body, which is the Church, is endowed with all the same glorious privileges as himself. One in him, she is the heir of Abraham (Gal. iii. 16, 28), she is royal, and she is priestly. Not independently of him, God forbid! but in him and by him she may approach as a priest to God, with access unimpeded, without need of further mediators, and God will hear and recognise and receive her priestly acts.

And so there descends to the separate members of this priestly body, because, and by force of their being members of it, the same priestly character. Each single one among them may now, in the great day of the Church, approach to God. He may, in the retirement of his closet, bewail his secret sins, address God as 'our Father which art in heaven,' cry Abba Father with the confident hope of a beloved and accepted son, not doubting that the fullest access has been won for him, and that God loves, tends, blesses him with not less care than if no other 'man nor angel lived in heaven or earth.' But his priestly character would disappear, and not be, if he tried to be a priest without the priestly unity; to be a member without the body, if he claimed that instead of sharing in a luminous atmosphere, in which he with others might walk and see God, there were determined to his single soul rays of separate and independent sonship which made him a priest of God irrespectively of the great unity of which he is a portion.

Whereinsoever then the individual priest needs support, instruction, guidance, assistance from the collective priesthood, there, we cannot doubt that some mode is likely to be provided by which he may be able to obtain it. And unspeakably shallow and unreal would be the system in which it should be maintained that there are no such needs, or that the single Christian is absolutely complete in these respects in himself alone. For not only must he derive in the first place, his priestly estate from the collective priesthood by being received in some manner, and at some specific time, into the Church, and owe to it his instruction in the truth of God, and his opportunity of partaking in whatever means of divine grace may belong to the common worship and devotion of Christians, in distinction from the separate prayers of a single individual; not only must he be liable to be deprived of his personal priesthood by the authority of that which is collective, and to be checked and controlled in various portions of the exercise of it, (for these are necessary parts of the power of deprivation,) but what is more and more exactly to our present point, he will sometimes need the aid and help of the collective priesthood even in such points as are most strictly and peculiarly priestly.

We grant that he has full and free access, as a member of Christ, to God in prayer. But what if he have sinned very heavily, and having been led to see the enormity of his offences, be led to despair of his retaining the access which he possessed before? The Church holds, as the Holy Scriptures teach, that there is some amount, degree, or kind of sin which is irremissible. If there be, then there must be degrees of sin, more and less easily remissible, leading up to this terrible consummation. There must be danger, before total loss: there must be conditions of deepening peril, conditions of decaying spiritual influence, conditions of diminishing facility of access, conditions of dwindled and still dwindling grace, and blessing, before the door of acceptance is finally closed, the day of grace done, and the doom of death even in life inevitable. And so it may possibly not be an unreasonable fear, which leads a sinner awakened to the keenest remorse for long-continued and heinous sin,—doubtful of his own repentance, doubtful of his own faith, doubtful whether the bitterness which he feels be not rather a foretaste of hell than any token of still surviving acceptableness,—to tremble in his inner soul, and shrink, and despair of his retaining the priestliness of his original condition, and to feel most anxious dread lest the attempt of *such as he* to approach God in prayer might not add sacrilege to other sin, and only deepen his guilt and misery.

What then shall we do? Shall we mock the dying patient by reminding him that he is a physician himself? Shall we insult the despairing penitent by telling him that he is himself a priest? Shall we tyrannically imprison him in his own single faith, when the very disease under which he labours is despair? Shall we limit the mercy of Christ, who actually by his divine breath did communicate the Holy Ghost to his priests for the remission of sins, by our miserable *logic*, which, defining priesthood after a certain arbitrary manner, then proceeds to annul the promise and gift of Christ to his priests, and so to his penitents?

Nor does there appear to be the least difficulty in believing that the collective priesthood of the body of Christ may have been, by Christ and his Apostles, determined to a succession of men, holding by continually derived title of authority from their predecessors, so as to trace their power directly up to the Lord himself. We do not now argue that this is the *only* method whereby such collective priesthood could be efficiently or properly administered, or maintain that circumstances might not be conceived under which the priestly body, well assured that the sacred presence was within it (for that they were indeed two or three duly gathered into the sacred name, and so a Church), might evolve from itself its own collective priestly powers, and delegate them to some of its members, or recommence a broken succession. We do not now argue so, because it is not to our immediate point; but we maintain that if the body be collectively priestly, and if the collective priestliness of the body be capable of imparting priestly benefit to those who are, confessedly, individual priests, and if such benefits, being possible, are also likely and to be expected when they are needed,—and all these points we hope that we have proved,—then that there is no possible reason to be alleged why the particular officers whose duty it is to be the channels of these particular benefits may not be selected, appointed, and guaranteed by means of a perpetual succession. There is no incompatibility, no absurdity in reason, in supposing that the Church may have its divine succession of priests tracing up to the Apostles, and so to the Lord himself, exercising the collective priesthood, even while every member of the Church is personally and truly a priest, when regarded by himself alone.

Let it not be thought that we are here arguing directly in favour of the succession as a matter of fact. *That* argument is to be maintained on different grounds,—grounds which we may confidently say are amply sufficient to support it against the attacks of all gainsayers. Our humbler object is to clear the historical argument from the rubbish of *à priori* objections, to do away with the shallow notion that they who hold the priesthood of individual Christians do thereby destroy and disprove all priesthood of ordained priests within the Church of God. We say then boldly, that if the collective priesthood be granted, no argument can be alleged to render it incredible or unlikely that the channels of that priestly power should be a succession of persons, deriving by perpetual ordination, and the gifts thereunto attached, from the Apostles and their Lord. If any person can prove it incredible, let him do so: we cannot undertake to remove difficulties which we have never heard, and cannot conceive.

One topic further, and we have done. It is possible that the theory of collective and individual priestliness, which we have here put forward, may seem new and strange to some readers; and they may be disposed to ask, 'where is all this to be 'found?' 'who is the acknowledged church writer who has laid 'it all down in this manner, and whom you follow?'

Our answer is, that every part of our view will be found, as is essential to every Catholic view of truth, maintained and upheld by every writer of confessed authority, wherever that particular portion of doctrine comes, in the order of his work, to be presented to his mind. If the complete and balanced theory be less easy to find, this deficiency is easily to be accounted for, and easily to be supplied.

Indeed, we may confidently say, that, if there be any writer of acknowledged weight and authority in the Church from whose works passages have been, or can be, adduced which apparently favour the Arnoldian hypothesis (passages, that is, in which the individual priestliness is put forward so singly and so strongly as to *seem* to carry any denial of the collective), there will be found other passages, and probably in abundance, to show that such a negative inference is entirely inadmissible, and that the writer, in fact, held no other view than that which we have been attempting to sketch. He may, in the course of his argument, have had need to urge with separate force the great truth of the individual priestliness,—that great truth which, in the history of the church, has been so often overlaid, forgotten, and usurped upon,—he may have wished to vindicate it from direct or indirect attacks to which it has been exposed; but we will undertake to prove that there is no writer of acknowledged catholic character who will be found so to have urged and insisted on the individual priestliness, as not, in the course of his doctrinal writings, to have acknowledged, and probably insisted upon, with equal or greater force, the other two truths of the connected theory, the collective priestliness, and the succession.

Take, for example, a passage of Tertullian (who *is* catholic, at least, on *this* point), which has been often used to favour the Arnoldian views, (we quote from an edition which makes it construe) 'Nonne et laici sacerdotes sumus? Scriptum est, 'regnum quoque nos, et sacerdotes Deo et patri suo fecit. Differentiam inter ordinem et plebem constituit ecclesiæ auctoritas, 'et honor per ordinis consessum sanctificatus adeo, ubi ecclesiastici ordinis non est consessus, et offers, et tingis, et sacerdos 'es tibi solus. Sed ubi tres, ecclesia est, licet laici.'[1] When, then, we find this same writer saying repeatedly such other things as these:—'Dandi quidem (baptismum) habet jus summus 'sacerdos, qui est episcopus, dehinc presbyteri et diaconi non 'tamen sine episcopi auctoritate, propter ecclesiæ honorem, quo 'salvo, salva pax est. Alioquin etiam laicis jus est, quod enim 'ex æquo accipitur, ex æquo dari potest.'[2] 'Edant ergo (Hæretici) origines ecclesiarum suarum. Evolvant ordinem episcoporum suorum, ita per successiones ab initio decurrentem, ut 'primus ille episcopus aliquem ex apostolis, vel apostolicis viris, 'qui tamen cum apostolis perseveraverit, habuerit auctorem et 'antecessorem. Hoc enim modo ecclesiæ apostolicæ census 'suos deferunt.'[3]—how can we interpret these passages so as to make them compatible with each other without supposing that the writer had in his mind, even though he had not put the parts of it together in any single passage, the precise theory which we have endeavoured to sketch?—the collective priesthood of the church—the individual priesthood of single believers—the collective priesthood determined to a succession of priests by divine appointment?

Hooker, again, is expressly referred to by Mr. Bunsen as offering, at least, negative support to his theory, by the admission of the possibility, under extreme circumstances, of ordination taking place without a bishop; thereby, it is inferred, so fully acknowledging the priestly power to inhere essentially in individual Christians, as to warrant the denial of it to any particular officers, or series of officers in the church.

---

[1] De Exhort. Castitatis, c. vii. [2] De Bapt. c. xvii. [3] De Præs. Hær. c. xxxii.

But how can this negative inference, which, be it observed, is the only thing which brings Hooker within the scope of Mr. Bunsen's argument, stand with the following passages of the same writer? (we quote from Mr. Keble's preface, p. lxxvi.):—'What angel in heaven could have said to man, as our Lord did 'unto Peter, Feed my sheep; preach; baptize; do this in remembrance of me; whose sins ye retain, they are retained; 'and their offences in heaven pardoned, whose faults ye shall 'on earth forgive? What think ye? Are these terrestrial 'sounds, or else are they voices uttered out of the clouds above? 'The power of the ministry of God translateth out of darkness 'into glory; it raiseth men from the earth, and bringeth God 'himself down from heaven; by blessing visible elements, it maketh 'them invisible grace; it giveth daily the Holy Ghost; it hath 'to dispose of that flesh which was given for the life of the 'world, and that blood which was poured out to redeem souls; 'when it poureth malediction upon the heads of the wicked, 'they perish; when it revoketh the same, they revive. Oh 'wretched blindness if we admire not so great power; more 'wretched if we consider it aright, and notwithstanding imagine 'that any but God can bestow it.'[1] 'Let us not fear to be 'herein bold and peremptory, that if any thing in the church's 'government, surely the first institution of bishops was from 'heaven, was even of God: the Holy Ghost was the author 'of it.'[2]

We have quoted these two writers because they are most apt to be quoted upon the Arnoldian side in this controversy; but we confidently repeat that there is no writer of acknowledged authority who, acknowledging the individual priestliness, does not balance that acknowledgment in other parts of his writings by acknowledging also the collective priestliness, and the succession; which two points make up the connected theory which we have ventured to sketch. We will not quote other writers, who would be endless, but will content ourselves with one passage from Pope Leo, which seems to us to put the whole matter in a very clear and just light. 'Nam licet universa ecclesia 'Dei distinctis ordinata sit gradibus, ut ex diversis membris 'sacrati corporis subsistat integritas; *omnes* tamen, sicut ait 'apostolus, *in Christo unum sumus:* nec quisquam ab alterius 'ita divisus est officio, ut non ad connexionem pertineat capitis 'cujuslibet humilitas portionis. In unitate igitur fidei atque 'baptismatis, indiscreta nobis societas, dilectissimi, et generalis 'est dignitas, secundum illud beatissimi Petri Apostoli sacratissimâ voce dicentis; *et ipsi tanquam lapides vivi superædificamini*

---

[1] Eccl. Pol. vii. 14. 11.

[2] Eccl. Pol. v. 77. 1.

'*in domos spiritales, sacerdotium sanctum, offerentes spiritales* '*hostias acceptabiles Deo per Jesum Christum.* Et infrà: *Vos* '*autem genus electum, regale sacerdotium, gens sancta, populus* '*acquisitionis.* Omnes enim in Christo regeneratos crucis signum 'efficit Reges, sancti vero Spiritus unctio consecrat sacerdotes: 'ut præter istam specialem nostri ministerii servitutem, universi 'spiritales et rationabiles Christiani agnoscant se regii generis, et 'sacerdotalis officii esse consortes. Quid enim tam regium, 'quam subditum Deo animum corporis sui esse rectorem? Et 'quid tam sacerdotale quam vovere Domino conscientiam 'puram, et immaculatas pietatis hostias de altari cordis offerre? 'Quod cum omnibus per Dei gratiam commune sit factum, religiosum tamen vobis atque laudabile est, de die provectionis 'nostræ quasi de proprio honore gaudere: ut unum celebretur 'in toto ecclesiæ corpore pontificii sacramentum, quod effuso 'benedictionis unguento, copiosiùs quidem in superiora pro'fluxit, sed non parcè etiam in inferiora descendit.'[1]

And here we might be content to leave these writers, and their theory, satisfied that the Church of England is still sufficiently sound at heart to reject teaching so utterly at variance with the whole body of primitive doctrine and discipline, but that the recent nomination of Dr. Hampden to the See of Hereford places in a still stronger light the actual danger in which the church is placed in this regard. It was fearful to think that the Chevalier Bunsen, besides his high character, learning, and station, had had influence enough with our governors in Church and State to effect the left-handed marriage of Anglicanism with Lutheranism which the church has seen exhibited in the establishment of the Bishopric in Jerusalem. It was fearful to think that Dr. Arnold's fresh, vivid style of correspondence, and his manly, soundhearted views of his office and duties as Master of Rugby School, had so won access for his destructive church theories, as to make his 'Remains' a sort of text-book on the church for statesmen, imperfectly informed upon the subject, and politically and liberally disinclined to the clergy of the Church of England, and their teaching. But the nomination by the Crown of Dr. Hampden for a bishopric brings the actual battle. Not content with setting on foot distant measures, or indicating a preference for heretical teachers, Lord John Russell has now thought proper to select the most notorious man in England,—notorious by having promulgated the dangerous opinions in the most conspicuous manner,—notorious by having been once and again condemned by the vote of the University of Oxford,—for the highest preferment in the heart of our own country, and to insist upon carrying this selection through, by the exercise of the royal prerogative, under the most odious act of a tyrannical period, in defiance of a very large body of the clergy and laity of the land headed by their bishops, and in a manner directly destructive of the spiritual rights of the church. Into the details of this appointment, and the correspondence and transactions to which it has given rise, we forbear to enter here; satisfying ourselves with expressing the hope that so insulting and extraordinary a challenge, on the part of the State to the Church, to relinquish both truth and freedom at its wanton bidding, can issue in nothing else than in the vindication of both; and that it is *impossible* for the Erastian, tyrannical, indefensible act of 25 Hen. VIII. to remain the law of a land, which, however little it may appreciate the truth of God, still claims to venerate, and makes large sacrifices to prove that it venerates, human liberality.

---

[1] Serm. iv. in Annivers. Assumpt. suæ.

But we must add a few words, in order to show that the teaching of this bishop designate (alas! the day!) of Hereford, is, in all essential points, identical with that which we have been criticizing, of Messrs. Bunsen and Arnold,—identical, we say, in essential points; and to this essential identity we beg to call the particular attention of such of our readers as may have been mystified by the publications of Dr. Hampden, subsequent to the date of the censure of the University of Oxford. Since that date the cautious Professor has simply *held his tongue*, upon the philosophical and theoretical points involved in his former more scientific discussions. He has republished those discussions, indeed, referred to them, sold them, declined to withdraw or retract them; but his line in teaching, since that time, has been to waive the whole subject, to talk of Christian doctrines as if he had never cut off the very trunk by which they claim to be joined to the root of Christian truth; to throw out phrases, and use modes of speaking, musical in the ears of a certain party in the Church, in order, thereby, to turn to his own advantage the prejudice which, since the time of his own condemnation, has grown up against the High-Church Divines; and this ingenious method has had no inconsiderable success. Men of station and reputation talk of his '*virtual retractation*,' of his having been '*sufficiently punished!*' of the '*soundness of his present views*,' of the '*greater danger of Romanism*,' till they become, practically, apologists of a system of teaching, really destructive of the Creeds, the Sacraments, the Doctrines, the authority, and the very being of the Church.

Like Mr. Bunsen and Dr. Arnold, Dr. Hampden totally disallows the authority of the Creeds. Indeed, his Bampton

Lectures may be fairly understood to be an express attack upon them.

He holds that the entire matter of revelation is simply and solely *fact:* ‘The only ancient, only catholic truth, is the ‘scriptural fact.’[1] ‘Dogmas of theology, *as such,* are human ‘authorities.’[2]

Does he attempt, in the preface to the second edition of the Lectures, to evade the force of his own words, and explain the word ‘*fact,*’ in such a manner as, by including doctrines, to nullify and stultify the whole discussion of the Bampton Lectures at a blow?

We will not characterize the candour and honesty of such a proceeding; but we will provide the due reply to it from his own words: ‘I venture to say, there are no propositions con‘cerning God in Scripture, detached from some event of Divine ‘Providence to which they refer, and on which they are founded. ‘Some, perhaps, will say, “An inspired writer has said thus, or ‘thus,—this, then, as asserted by him, is matter-of-fact; and, ‘accordingly, it is on matter-of-fact, in this sense, that the ‘Christian revelation is said to be founded.” *The expression,* ‘“*matter-of-fact,*” *will, no doubt, admit this sense;* but, to inter‘pret the Scripture revelation in this manner, is only to return ‘to the assertion of its dogmatic character in another form. It ‘brings us back to take the words, or propositions, written by ‘the inspired writers, as the substance of the revelation, instead ‘of looking to the authenticated dealings of God in the world. ‘When I say, therefore, that the Christian revelation is matter‘of-fact, I INTEND by it to express my conviction that the ‘substance of the revelation is the DOINGS AND ACTIONS of God; ‘I have always before my view some EVENT in the HISTORY of ‘God's PROVIDENCES to which I refer it.’[3]

If Dr. Hampden's meaning is not ascertained, and his evasion not annihilated by himself (both of which we hold to be very satisfactorily accomplished), let us beg our readers to refer back to page 68 of this Number, in which an extract is made from Mr. Bunsen's 18th page.

Can any one doubt that the ACTS of Mr. Bunsen's Creed illustrate the FACTS of Dr. Hampden's?

Like Dr. Arnold, again, who cannot deny to the Unitarians the name of Christian, because they differ only in interpretation from the Church, Dr. Hampden, too, ‘when he looks at the ‘reception by the Unitarians, both of the Old and New Testa‘ment, cannot, for his part, strongly as he dislikes their theology,

---

[1] Bampton Lectures, iii. p. 149.

[2] Ibid., viii. p. 375.

[3] It is a *moral fact,* of no slight significancy, that this self-convicting passage is omitted in the second edition of the *Observations on Religious Dissent,* p. 14.

‘ deny to those, who acknowledge this basis of divine facts, the ‘ name of Christian.’

Dr. Hampden, indeed, in his crusade against Christian doctrine, outdoes even Dr. Arnold; for the actual words of Holy Writ itself are not safe from his miserable philosophy, claiming to distinguish the revelation from the terms in which it is conveyed, in order to deny all authority in the terms.

St. Peter's expression, for instance, 2. i. 4, Θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως, is pantheistic.[1] Dr. Hampden ‘ appeals from the chaff ‘ to the wheat; from Paul philosophizing to Paul preaching, and ‘ entreating, and persuading.’[2] ‘ We must not take the words or ‘ propositions written by the inspired writers, as the substance ‘ of the revelation, but must look to the authenticated (?) deal- ‘ ings of God in the world.’[3] Even the *sacred words of our Lord himself* fare no better than those of the apostle's with this audacious speculator: ‘ In the instance of the woman thus sud- ‘ denly cured, he is described as having perceived that some one ‘ had touched him, by the fact that *virtue* had gone out of Him ‘ —a mode of speaking characteristic of the prevalent idea con- ‘ cerning the operation of Divine influence, as of something ‘ passing from one body to another.’[4]

So much for doctrines. In ordinances, too, Dr. Hampden's teaching is hardly to be distinguished from Dr. Arnold's. Dr. Hampden says, ‘ Theologians have not been content to rest on ‘ the simple fact of the Divine ordinance, appointing certain ‘ external rites as essential parts of Divine service on the part ‘ of man, available to the blessing of the receiver.’[5] Dr. Arnold: ‘ When Christians met together, and received the bread and ‘ wine of their common living, as the body and blood of Christ, ‘ such an act had a real tendency to strengthen and confirm ‘ their souls, and the Holy Spirit made such a communion a ‘ constant means of grace to those who partook of it.’[6] ‘ God's ‘ grace is conveyed by the sacraments, morally, because the ‘ joining Christ's Church, in the first instance, and the constantly ‘ refreshing our communion with it afterwards, are actions ‘ highly beneficial to our moral nature.’[7] Dr. Hampden: ‘ The ‘ faith of the receiver is the true consecrating principle.’[8] Dr. ‘ Arnold: ‘ The agreement of those communicating, their com- ‘ mon faith and love, constitute the real consecration of the ‘ bread and wine.’[9]

In respect of the authority of the Church, in her primitive, or universal teaching, Dr. Hampden holds, that ‘ it is only an

---

[1] Bampton Lectures, p. 197.

[2] Ibid., p. 375.

[3] Observations on Religious Dissent, p. 14.

[4] Bampton Lectures, p. 316.

[5] Ibid., p. 312.

[6] On the Church, p. 20.

[7] Ibid., p. 63.

[8] Bampton Lectures, p. 323.

[9] On the Church, p. 21.

'*assumption* that universality and ubiquity are made the tests of 'religious doctrine. . . . . Truth is rather the attribute of the 'few than of the many. . . . . Who shall pronounce anything to be 'Divine truth, *simply because* it has the marks of having been '*generally, or universally*, received among men?'[1] 'To me it 'matters little what opinion has been *prior*, has been advocated 'by the shrewdest wit or deepest learning, has been most 'popular, *most extensive in its reception*.'[2]

Dr. Arnold, holding the language of St. Ignatius 'exaggerated,' and 'more vehement than wise,' and considering it to have been 'most palpably abused by Cyprian,' nevertheless feels it 'satisfactory to find that the Church, in the very first century, 'had not grossly corrupted Christian truth.'[3] 'We are to seek 'for our knowledge of Christianity nowhere else but in the 'Scriptures; what *we find* there is a part of Christianity, 'whether recognised as such, or no, in after ages; what *we do* '*not find* there is no part of Christianity, however early, or 'however general, may have been the attempts to interpolate it.'[4]

Thus, in both these writers is the whole structure of doctrine and sacraments, and the whole frame of Church authority in teaching, and succession in administering, annulled, and done away. Certain Divine facts, distinguishable from all words, even those of our Holy Lord and his Apostles themselves, are the entire matter of revelation; these, all who call themselves Christians may find, or not find, may understand, theorize about, interpret, as they please. There are, also, two external rites, which do men moral good when faithfully partaken in. Behold the framework of the Christian teaching of those who are, it appears, to be the model of our future Bishops—the men to fix, to all coming times, the character and doctrine of the English Church, given over, henceforth, as far as a Whig Prime Minister can give her, to Arnoldism, Bunsenism, and Hampdenism!

But, God be praised! the vitality of the Church in England rests not upon the propriety or impropriety of this or that appointment; nor, melancholy as is this recent attack upon her truth and liberty, has it failed to be followed by such a large, such a powerful and authoritative resistance and remonstrance, as must show to all the world, that her heart is yet in the right place, and that she still recognises and holds precious the divine verities of the Gospel. If only her sons and daughters are meek and faithful in their zeal; if they are not tempted, in fretfulness and impatience, to take some hasty and schismatical step, mistaking a trial of the faith, and soundness of the Church, for a token of her being deserted of her Saviour; if they avail themselves, in all humility and devotion, of the means of Divine grace, which she is the rich channel of imparting to them; if they hold fast by her primitive service books, and shut their ears to this deluge of real infidelity, which is setting in from Germany;—then we may hope that God will bring good out of our evil, and even by the very means of this reckless, insulting, and most lamentable appointment, pour out unexpected blessing on our suffering Church.

---

[1] Bampton Lectures, p. 356.

[2] Ibid., p. 149.

[3] Ibid., pp. 95, 100, 122.

[4] Ibid., p. 47.

Art. IV.—1. *The Life of Luther, written by himself, collected and arranged by* M. Michelet, *Member of the Institute, Author of the History of France, &c. Translated by* William Hazlitt, *Esq. of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law.* London: David Bogue.

2. *Histoire de la Vie, des Ecrits, et des Doctrines de Martin Luther. Par* M. Audin, *Membre des Académies Royales de Lyon, Turin, &c.* Paris: L. Maison.

3. *The Mission of the Comforter; and other Sermons, with Notes. By* Julius Charles Hare, M.A. *Archdeacon of Lewes, Rector of Herstmonceux, and late Fellow of Trinity College.* London: J. W. Parker. Cambridge: Macmillan.

The life and character of Luther have been brought rather conspicuously before public attention of late years. The taste for the striking and powerful forms of character, which has been so general among us lately, pervading the most different schools of sentiment and doctrine, has contributed to this. The movement of opinion respecting the Reformation has also contributed. The special mixture of character which Luther exhibits, has kept alive the discussions about him, when once begun. He is peculiarly a man whom persons both like to attack and like to defend. To his advocates belongs the undoubted fact that he was a great man; to his opponents the very awkward question, whether he was a saint. He was very amiable; he was very virulent. He was frank and simple; he was crafty and double. He was not vain; he was self-willed and over-bearing. He liked power; he was indifferent to station. He had an ardent faith; he showed germs of rationalism. Few characters have exposed themselves more to the attacks of adversaries, or more engaged the sympathies of friends. His admirers are, indeed, fond of him,—fonder, perhaps, for the very fact that he has left himself so open to attack as he has. They think it an unfairness in fate to Luther, or in Luther to himself, for which they are bound in justice to compensate. Should he suffer for the temper which always made him show himself off to the worst? And should the fault, which his own frankness and carelessness about himself have put into our possession, not rather commend him the more to the generous judge?

Three biographies of Luther have appeared within the last few years; one by a friend, another by an enemy, and a third by a neutral. D'Aubigné's biography—for the first half of his History of the Reformation may be so called—has the merit of a good deal of information, and a lively and pointed style, but is the thorough-going work of a partizan. The writer is always colouring, and will let nothing speak for itself. His comments do not occupy particular positions, and collect themselves into main groups, but are constant and ever recurring. The over quantity of detail in the narrative—a fault on its own account—is a worse fault as being so prolific of comment; for the smallest detail seldom wants its appendage. If the historian has no remark to make, the preacher has: and the reader, harassed with an endless reiteration of small reflections and officious instructions, retaliates, by regarding M. d'Aubigné as a writer a good deal more copious than weighty. His omissions in the line of fact are nearly as large, moreover, as his additions in the way of comment. He leaves out whole portions of Luther's character, or but faintly alludes to them. His aim is to assimilate Luther's ethical and religious mould as much as possible to that of an evangelical preacher of the present day. Luther does not gain by his biographer's tenderness on this head; and the same process which cuts off the irregularities, narrows the expanse, and tames the freedom of character.

M. Audin has, as might be expected, inserted a good many of the touches which M. d'Aubigné's pencil left out. Nor, though highly relishing his task, has he performed it ill-temperedly. His unfairness is not a malicious one; he delights in the amiable tasks of the favourist, and extols all his friends with innocent audacity, the notorious Tetzel among the rest: but he is not harsh and vituperative to opponents. He only gives, however, the more active and fiery parts of the Reformer's character, and not the whole of it; and describes Luther's external career better than Luther himself.

M. Michelet's Life hardly professes to be more than a crude and straggling performance: its composition having been the amusement of the writer during an illness. It consists, principally, of passages strung together from the table-talk, and those parts of Luther's writings where the Reformer speaks of himself. M. Michelet stands idly by, and gives the reader no assistance. An admiration of Luther's greatness, sympathy with his genial flow of spirits, and amusement at his faults and extravagances, compose, as far as we can see, the feeling of the impartial biographer toward his hero: and the sceptic seems to gaze with quiet pleasure upon the medley which the religious leader, saint, and prophet of so many millions of Christians exhibits.

The mode in which Luther is introduced to our notice, in the pages of national history, creates an impression of him as primarily a practical, rather than a doctrinal reformer. He comes before us suddenly as the opponent of some great practical abuses in the Church: we connect him, in the first instance, with the resistance to indulgences. We thus picture a doctrinal movement, as arising, in process of time, out of a practical one; and Luther appears one of those rough, energetic minds which, only alive at first to the palpable and tangible, gradually advance to the department of opinion and belief. This is undoubtedly true of the multitudes whom Luther moved. They were moved, in the first instance, by the gross practical abuses in the Church; and those supplied that groundwork to the reforming movement, without which it could not have advanced at all. But it is not true of Luther. If there are two classes of influential men in the world, great practical men and men who propagate ideas, Luther belonged, in the first instance, to the latter. His mind was full of an idea, and he wished to propagate it. National history brings us across him for the first time engaged in a particular practical movement; but his biography shows that the doctrinal was then already begun and in progress.

The process by which leading ideas are arrived at is generally that of doubt and perplexity. A particular class of minds feels strongly the difficulties which surround the whole subject of morality and religion. Some have one difficulty, and some another. They dwell upon the obstacles to their internal peace with an intensity natural, or morbid, as may be: and, after they have brooded long enough, they hit on a solution. This solution is then the idea which occupies and fills their minds. They have felt a want, and they have relieved it; they have put their question, and had their answer: they have been in suspense, and now are settled. They prize the new conviction, because it succeeds to so much indefiniteness and void. The search has enhanced the discovery, the toil the reward; and the offspring of mental troubles is loved as an only child. The idea which has destroyed a difficulty is a victorious champion on which the mind reposes ever after, and to which it refers all of system, adjustment, and completeness it has attained to.

Luther had a natural character, which made him strongly alive to difficulties; that is to say, a character which partook largely of melancholy. Dante, Cromwell, Dr. Johnson, Cowper, Rousseau, Lord Byron, Shelley, are instances of men, who in their different ways, high or low, religious or sceptical, uncouth or refined, were melancholy men. Luther was one of this class of men. He had a mind intently self-contemplative, and profoundly unquiet, which, except the strongest active occupations diverted it, preyed upon itself; scrutinized its own faith, feelings, fears and hopes; pried into the mysteries of its own nature; and provoked internal dissatisfactions and struggles. Luther speaks of his great scenes of trial as being throughout life internal. His agonies, his temptations, his colloquies with himself or with Satan, the tenderest controversy and the most formidable disputant, were always within him. He had just that disposition on which particular difficulties, and the ideas which seem to solve them, lay remarkable hold.

The opening circumstances of Luther's life were not calculated to discourage or tame such a disposition. The calm of a restless spirit is activity; and quiet unsettles and agitates it. The retirement and dulness of the Augustin monastery at Wittenburgh, threw him the more upon himself and his own thoughts. The particular circumstances of his entrance into monastic life were also trying. A stroke of lightning which killed his bosom friend by his side, according to some writers, though others make the thunderstorm and the death of Alexis two different events, inspired him with sudden terror. A lively, joyous temperament was also most alive to calls; and possessed a power of forming sudden strong resolutions. He was able, in a moment, to change the prospects of a life; a vow uttered on the spot, dedicated him to monasticism; and the accomplished, philosophical, literary academician, the favourite of fellow-students who enjoyed his humour, and of scientific professors who predicted his greatness, called his friends together, enjoyed an evening of brilliant conversation and music, and the next morning knocked at the gate of the Augustin monastery, which closed after him. But the young devotee was not made a monk by the change. The constant interruptions to formal prayer were irksome to him: he did not stomach the household monastic tasks he was set to; tasks, indeed, needlessly humiliating and offensive, and, if intended to correct the fastidiousness of his previous education, arguing a blundering, however well-meaning discipline, in the monastery. Luther felt himself, in addition to the ordinary confinements and privations of a monastic life, to be among inferior and unsympathizing minds, alone, suspected, and ill-used.

There was another and more direct cause which led to religious melancholy and difficulties. Luther had ardent aspirations after the perfect and saintly character. There is not the smallest reason for doubting not only his sincerity, but his strength of will, and readiness to endure the greatest self-denial and mortification in pursuit of that character. But, impatient of regular discipline and routine, the more simple and external motive of obedience, for leading a holy life, was supplied in his case by a motive of another stamp. He had, what has been a frequent feature, though never a very sound one, in religionists, an active, not to say fidgety, desire for a state of conscious and palpable peace of mind. He was ambitious of inward satisfaction, the sensation of spiritual completeness. His devotion was based upon a direct aim at this result. He pursued it vehemently by ascetic means. He fasted, prayed, watched long and rigorously. 'Often on returning to his cell he knelt at the 'foot of the bed, and remained there until day-break.' His asceticism, mingling with the internal fever and tumult of his mind, gave him an unnatural strength; and he relates that 'once 'for a whole fortnight, he neither ate, drank, or slept.' His health gave way before such severities: from being fresh and plump, he became pale and emaciated, and was brought almost to death's door. One little fact shows the remarkable union of great irregularity in religion, with a morbid aim at perfectness. He would omit his daily breviary prayers for long periods: then, when his conscience smote him, he would make good the default with literal exactness, and scrupulously go through, in one continuous act, the precise amount of devotions he had omitted. That is to say, he was not satisfied with the feeling of having done something to atone for his fault: he wanted the feeling of having annihilated the fault itself, and put himself exactly into his original state as he stood before it was committed. In this way Luther went on, seeking with all the eagerness of direct effort an absolutely clear conscience. The pursuit, of course, did not succeed. A clear conscience was always farther off the farther he pursued it; and at the close of each stage of his devotional course, he was as discontented with himself as when he began. 'At the foot of the altar, his 'hands clasped, his eyes full of tears,' he prayed for peace, and found none. 'One morning the door of his cell not being open 'as usual, the brethren became alarmed; they knocked, and 'there was no reply. The door was burst in, and Fra Martin 'was found stretched on the ground, in a state of ecstasy, scarcely 'breathing, and well-nigh dead.' At the sight of the Holy Sacrament borne in a procession, 'he perspired at every pore, and 'thought he should die of fear.' Vexed, wearied, harassed, and faint, his mind fell a prey to a formidable difficulty to which its labours and aspirations had introduced it.

There is one apparent grievance attaching to our moral nature, which all who cultivate that nature with any degree of strictness must in a degree experience. It is connected with the operations of conscience. However we might be led beforehand, by considerations of the general nature of moral goodness, to expect that goodness would produce internal satisfaction and self-approval, we find that as a matter of experience, it fails to produce this. Conscience does not allow of such sensations. Good acts leave the soul as they found it, uneasy and discontented with itself, and under a sense of sin, even as regards the performance of those very acts themselves. Within the world of experience good acts disappoint. They do not accomplish their natural end, and fulfil their essential promise. Moral beings yearn for self-approval: they feel the absence of it as a void and a pain: they are told to act virtuously, and that they will have it; but they do act virtuously, and self-approval does not come. Virtue seems to stand them in no stead, and do them no service here: they might as well be vicious. The greatest sinner, the greatest saint, are equidistant from the goal where the mind rests in satisfaction with itself. All approach to that point labours under some inherent contradiction: all progress is a stand-still; all impetus and determination spend themselves with the circles of a mathematical necessity: the eager will shoots forward, but the laws of the moral world are firm, and unseen impossibility makes its appearance in results. The defect is not one resulting from the degree of their virtue: no tendency in the universal quality to meet the craving for such self-approval appears. The tendency is the other way, and with the growth in goodness grows the sense of sin. One law fulfilled, shows a thousand neglected; and virtue, as it really advances, recedes more and more, in our own contemplation of it, into the position of one weak and poor particle, struggling amid a mass of evil in the character. Moral advancement, as a natural consequence, destroys the sense of merit, and produces that of sin; and thus, as a natural consequence, it seems to defeat itself.

This unkindly effect of goodness, moreover, if it is such, is not kept out of sight in Scripture, but put prominently forward, and suggested to us. For real goodness is in many passages there actually and in the most marked way *tested*, by its producing just the contradictory impression to that of goodness, in the individual's own conscience. Indeed, so determinately is this contradictory consequence attached to, and made the natural consequence of, the state of goodness; that by a strong figure of speech the holy text sometimes puts the consequence of the state for the state itself, and speaks of righteousness as if it were sin; just as it, on the other hand, speaks of sin as it were righteousness. And a whole line of expression meets us from which one would at first sight suppose, that sinners were actual favourites of God as such; and that, on the contrary, the righteous were not at all pleasing to Him. There is a coldness in the remarks about the righteous, as if God were angry with them because, persisting in their original integrity, they did not give Him the opportunity of exercising his sovereign free grace and pity toward them: sinners, on the other hand, are dearly loved, because they give Him this opportunity; they have His affections, on the principle which prevails in the sphere of ordinary human feeling, that 'pity is akin to love;' whereas those who are independent of us, and ask nothing from us, we do not care for. 'They that are whole need not a physician, but they 'that are sick.' 'I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to 'repentance.' 'There is joy in the presence of the angels of God, 'over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine 'just persons which need no repentance.' 'Her sins which are 'many are forgiven her, for she loveth much: but to whom little 'is forgiven the same loveth little.' Thus the parable of the lost sheep; the parable of the lost piece of money; the parable of the lost son. All these parables create at first sight the impression of it being an actual advantage to be lost and to be a sinner, something to be coveted and sought after with all our might. The reader naturally immediately thinks that he had much rather be the sheep that was lost than one of those that had never gone astray; and had much rather be the son who had wandered, and was greeted on his return with such an overflow of affection, than the son who had never wandered, and had no such greeting. Now it, of course, is absurd to suppose that actual sin is pleasing to God, actual righteousness not pleasing to him; indeed, we know from the context that the 'righteous' to whom Our Lord alludes, were actually the most wicked of mankind, viz. the Pharisees who crucified Him,—men who could only be righteous in the sense of being righteous in their own eyes. The feeling of being sinful and the feeling of being righteous, then, are, under the expressions sin and righteousness, the real things which God respectively praises and blames. Still the language is very remarkable, as fixing in such a direct and summary way this contradictory effect upon goodness. In the Gospel self-approval appears as something signally unfit for the creature; enormous, abominable, and *contra Deum.* It appears as the mark of the beast, the sign, where it exists, that the soul has departed from God, and relapsed into its own vile, dead, and selfish nature. There is a happiness, indeed, which belongs to conscious merit, soberly expecting its reward in the course of nature, of which the whole-day's labourer waiting for his wages is the exemplar; and uninstructed reason fixes on that as the happiness of the saint. But the Gospel, in describing the joy of the rewarded saint, has recourse to a very different type. It refers us to those indescribable emotions which seize the mind upon any sudden rescue from evil, which it has no right to expect. The parables of the lost piece of money, and the lost sheep, and the lost son, all appeal to this type of joy; and intimate the great superiority of the pleasures of this type to those of the former, as having, from the very nature of the case, so much more liveliness and depth in them; the sensations of possession and safety necessarily having an acme and intensity after loss and danger which they could not have had before. For the reward of goodness, then, the Gospel gives us a pleasure of this type; that is to say, it gives not the peace of self-approval but the joy of pardon: the most accepted man has, by some mystery, most sins forgiven, and his happiness lies in that forgiveness. Philosophy of old dreamed, indeed, of the happiness of conscious virtue; and the 'memory of a well-spent life' filled its disciples with serene thoughts, and bade them look for the rewards of self-discipline in the act of self-contemplation. The wise man looked within himself and was satisfied; the world without was wild, but he was tranquil, balanced, and perfect. He had always a retrospect which consoled, and a conscience which supported him. He had done well, and was recompensed; he had worked, and he had his wages; and he received his reward with the dignity and self-possession which belongs to one who enjoys a right. Self-approval was the *præmium virtutis* of ancient philosophy. Most natural ambition. But how roughly did Christianity break these morning slumbers of the wise and good! 'Awake, thou that 'sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee 'life.' The dream was dispelled, and man awoke to real life and facts; he was shown himself, and saw what he had never seen before—a feeble will, effort always short, struggle ending in self-contempt, and virtue never got, but always to be attained. The mystery of conscience was revealed; and he discovered that he had done nothing, had secured no standing ground. From the yawning pit he reached forth a hand as he was sinking; it was caught, and he was saved. Then followed a pleasure, in comparison with which all that his philosophy had offered him was nothing—the pleasure of rescue. The Gospel destroyed one set of satisfactions, but replaced them with a higher. For the calmness and repose of self-approval, there was the intense, quick, miraculous delight of pardon; for human satisfaction there was superhuman, and for the order of nature the mystery of grace.

The inevitable tendency of human goodness, then, being to produce the sense of sin, it is to be remarked next, that such sense of sin is not the same with the common ordinary feeling so called, that is, with remorse and a bad conscience. A good action produces a sense of sin indeed, and a bad action does; but it would be absurd to say, that the feeling in the mind after performing a good action, was exactly the same with the feeling after performing a bad one. In the one case the conscience is displeased with the action as simply bad; in the other case it is displeased with it because it falls short of absolute good. That sense of sin which grows with advance in goodness is less properly the sense of sin than the sense of imperfection. The sense of imperfection is a feeling quite strong enough for the occasion, quite sufficient, that is, to explain and account for the class of painful and humiliating sensations which have to be accounted for; for imperfection is *quasi* sin, and affects the mind in a way somewhat similar and cognate to that in which actual sin does. The sense of it is galling, painful, humiliating, just as the sense of sin is. Let any one examine, by a reference to his own feelings and experience, what the peculiar effect of imperfection upon the mind is. Its effect is to spoil anything done as an object of regard and contemplation. Nor is this the case in morals only, but in art, science, literature. It is so much the constitution of the human mind to seek finish and completeness, that any falling short of that is a disappointment which it cannot get over. The end is the test of true being; and things only really are, when they are finished, are perfect. The work which falls short of that point is only an embryo of a work: and, the vertex of perfection once conceived in the mind, all below is confused, chaotic, formless. Take any artistic creation of our minds—a book, a drawing, a building, a mechanical contrivance—we were absolutely pleased with it so long as we thought it perfect, that is to say, so long as we did not realize any definite falling short in it. But let a definite falling short be once seen, and let us once have in our mind a clear image of the work more perfect than we have made it, and that complacency goes. As an object of contemplation our work is marred, it offends us, and we eject it from our thoughts, and think no more of it than we can help. We betake ourselves to the future indeed, and to that hope which happily no experience can ever defeat, that the next thing we do will be satisfactory; but the thing done is defaced, the past is taken from us. Such is the law of a nature which aspires to perfection. The point rises higher and higher, throwing disaster and defeat upon all below it. It is the same in morals: an action is in morals what a work of art, or a composition, is in art and literature. Take any action, or course of action, however conscientious, nay, heroic; it ceases to be an object of satisfactory contemplation as soon as ever the mind realizes a definite better, which it could and ought to have been. Thus, suppose an extraordinary act in one of the religious departments of prayer, fasting, or charity. An ascetic worshipper stays on his knees for hours; he stays till his mind is painfully wearied and exhausted. But free will is strong, and could keep him there longer if he exerted it sufficiently. Nevertheless the desire for relief prevails, and he rises, either to recreate or to rest himself. Now certainly he has performed a religious act of some difficulty, and might so far feel self-approval; but then arises the uncomfortable consciousness that he has wilfully curtailed it. The act immediately loses its wholeness, and the wilful stopping short is more annoying than the advance up to that point is satisfactory. The sin of not having done more, spoils the goodness of having done so much; indulged frailty and infirmity vex and occupy the conscience, and the consequence is, that he has more of the feeling of sin than if he had never done the act to begin with. It would be the same in any other religious department. Imagine this sense of imperfection deepening and enlarging, eating into the core of every good act, and spoiling and defacing in proportion to the extent of that material which virtuous effort supplies it to deface; and we have before us the progress of that peculiar sense of sin which grows with the advance in goodness.

Imperfection, then, being the cause of that sense of sin which accompanies good works, the view which we take of such good works, in consequence of such sinfulness attaching to them, depends on the view we take of imperfection. Now there is one view of imperfection, which, fully recognising the faultiness and defectiveness which must attach to every imperfect production as such, and even allowing the rigid definition of true existence to be perfection, still leaves an imperfect production a *something*, and does not wholly annihilate it. With respect to the subject before us, such a view refuses to pronounce of the goodness of man's works, that, because it is imperfect, it is therefore no goodness at all, and to deprive it of all cognizableness. According to it, there are in the constitution of things approaches and tendencies as well as completions. These works are not nothing, because they are not at all; nor because they are infinitely distant from infinite goodness are they reduced to an equality with absolute stationariness. Space is infinite, and yet there is a difference between a yard and a mile. Time is infinite, and yet an hour is longer than a minute. On a line which travels from a given goal into infinity one may proceed no way at all, another a short way, another a longer way. The merest reaching forward of the human soul toward goodness is a moral something; approaches are cognizable, measurable, appreciable things. In the confessed absence of the absolute attribute, an inferior and subordinate goodness is thus saved for human works, and something of, or belonging to, the nature of goodness is left in them. And this view of imperfection is the one which the conscience itself takes. That displeasure at defect and shortcoming, however real and however disturbing, which grows with advance in goodness, is not after all unaccompanied with another and a pleasing kind of consciousness. Though it is a part of truth to call conscience insatiable and self-condemning, it is not the whole of it. If it condemns on one side, it justifies on another. It censures and it commends in one and the same act of reflection. The human soul is such a marvellous, many-sided, and intricate creation, that no one line of observation can do it justice or represent it fairly. Peace and disappointment mingle, and tempered oppositions compose the soul's, as they do the body's, health. Rising satisfaction feels the drawback; and, on the other hand, even in the lowest abasements and self-condemnations of a true saint, there is a latent confidence arising out of his own works. If conscience accuses too harshly, conscience itself is judged for doing so, and a higher conscience steps in. 'If our heart condemn 'us, God is greater than our heart.'—'Yea, I judge not mine 'own self.' Though conscience will not let us feed on its satisfactions, it gives us a taste of them, and allows something which is, and is not, self-approval. Thus, it is absurd to say that a good life is to produce no consolatory and joyful reflections whatever in the retrospect. 'I have fought a good 'fight,' says St. Paul; 'I have kept the faith; henceforth there is 'laid up for me a crown of righteousness.' The same Scripture which so sternly rebukes a proud self-approval, directs us, nevertheless, to a certain state of mind which it calls a 'conscience void of offence,' and allows the true-hearted and honest soul, amid the reproach of an ungodly world, to vindicate itself, and find consolation in the consciousness of its own truth and integrity. 'I have not dwelt with vain persons, neither have 'I had fellowship with the deceitful.' 'I have loved the habi'tation of thine house.' 'I have had as great delight in the 'way of thy testimonies as in all manner of riches.' 'O turn 'from me shame and rebuke, for I have kept thy testimonies.' 'I have chosen the way of truth, and thy judgments have 'I laid before me.' 'Thy statutes have been my songs.' 'I 'am wiser than the aged, because I keep thy commandments.'

But Luther had thrown himself into a temper of mind which was not favourable to taking such a *via media* in the estimation of good works. A too ambitious and direct pursuit of spiritual satisfaction,—a too great longing for the palpable and the apprehensible in religion, had over-stimulated and unbalanced him. A morbid eagerness for some extreme and perfect state of self-approval and conscious elevation, and an irregular and headstrong asceticism pursued for its attainment, presented him unprepared for meeting disappointment; and the result was, that when that disappointment came, as it infallibly must come sooner or later, and when, after an excited pursuit, the impossibility of the object at last broke upon him, and he found that self-approval ever fled, and perfection never came, he felt the vehement impulse immediately of a disappointed man to insist on the very contrary extreme. To an impetuous nature the favourite alternative is all or none: the work half done annoys, and there is a pleasure in effacing it altogether. As Luther could not find a wholly approving conscience, he would have a simply condemning one; and as good works could not be perfect, he would not have them to be good works at all. A rigid definition of goodness, as perfect goodness, annihilated at one stroke all goodness below that point, because it was below it; converting it, as if in revenge, into absolute evil. That sense of sin which obedience created, and which increased in proportion to obedience, was in Luther's retaliatory disgust confounded with sin itself; and the law, in theological language, made productive of sin only.

Such was the conclusion to which Luther came; its first effect was to make him turn round with fierceness and hostility upon the whole system of things which maintained such a balk, to a degree that the character of the Deity himself seemed at stake with him. '*Ego ipse offendebar,*' are his words, '*ut optarem nunquam me esse creatum hominem.*' 'I was 'indignant, and gave silent utterance to murmuring, if not 'altogether to blasphemy. I said to myself, Is it not, then, 'enough that wretched sinners, already damned for original sin, 'should be overwhelmed with so many miseries by the decrees 'of the Decalogue, but God must add further misery to misery 'by his Gospel, menacing us even there with his justice and 'anger?' He addressed God in the language of offended Job: 'Thou art my enemy without cause.' 'Jerome, and other 'fathers, had trials—those of the flesh; Augustin and Ambrose 'had trials—those of the persecuting sword; but mine were far 'worse, they came from the angel of Satan, who strikes with 'the fist.' There is nothing vituperative or disparaging of Luther, in saying that he had, in his intellectual nature, suppressed, indeed, by a powerful though irregular faith, an element of that sensitive and rebellious temperament which has made men before now atheists. Lucretius saw a great difficulty in the unsatisfying nature of religion, *i.e.* conscience, which he accused of filling the mind with horror and self-condemnation, instead of peace:—

> 'Quæ caput a cœli regionibus ostendebat
> Horribili super aspectu mortalibus instans.'

He thought this must be wrong, and therefore denied the truth of religion altogether. Shelley's atheism was connected with difficulties in the same department: his whole nature rebelled against what appeared to him to be the issue of the moral process in the human soul:—

> 'And who made terror, madness, crime, remorse,
> Which from the links of the great chain of things,
> To every thought within the mind of man
> Sway and drag heavily, and each one reels
> Under the load towards the pit of death;
> Abandoned hope, and love that turns to hate,
> *And self-contempt, bitterer to drink than blood.*'

The more simple portion of mankind see difficulties only as facts, and not as difficulties; every stoppage is only their natural resting-place, their minds exactly fit in with facts, and feel no pressure. But others cannot see a difficulty without seeing its bearing; a subtle thread connects it immediately with their central faith, the responsibility is thrown back upon the foundation, and the whole system to which it attaches feels the challenge. All the world sees the existence of evil, but there is every shade of perception of it as a difficulty, from that temper of mind which does not see it as a difficulty at all, to that with whom it shakes the very throne of God Himself. Luther, who now saw a difficulty of nature in the artificial and exaggerated strength which a theory of his own had given it, felt the effect of his own work; and that state of absolute evil in man which a gratuitously rigid definition of goodness had imposed, agitated and puzzled him. He pictured miserable man vainly fighting with a stern and inexorable impossibility, which excluded him from ever attaining that chief good to the pursuit of which his nature impelled him; and the whole construction of the human soul, which imposed toil and agony and rewarded with self-contempt, was a scandal. The insatiableness of the law, the law of conscience, was a grievance in the constitution of things: 'The more you try to fulfil it, the more you will transgress it.' 'You accumulate law upon law, and all issues but in miserable 'self-torture and pain. *Una lex gignit alias decem*—one law 'begets ten more, till they mount up to infinity.' 'The stone of 'Sisyphus ever rolls, the vessel of the Danaides never fills.' With a Manichæan intensity he insisted upon the absolute evil of all visible and perceptible nature. The sun was darkness, and the moon refused to give her light, and the stars of heaven 'were extinguished. 'In man and in the devil spiritual things were extinct.' A fierce hatred of the world rose up, of this whole visible system of things, as so much pure evil—'a world 'of dread and ruin, of sin, and anger, and judgment, where is 'nothing celestial, nothing divine; which is nothing else but 'the kingdom of the devil, a flood of death, hell, sin, and all 'evils, oppressing quaking, miserable man.' 'Do what thou 'wilt, *tu es in hoc seculo nequam*, thou art in this wicked world; 'this world which is darkness, not is *in* darkness, but *is* darkness itself.' Luther's language, after he had arrived at his explanation of this evil, shows how it must have worked upon him before. Throughout his writings there come up continually traces of a state of mind which had seen something really wrong, and to be complained of, in the constitution of things; and his forms of expression edge with a venturesome nicety upon, without actually touching, the justice of the Deity. In his book, *De Servo Arbitrio*, a fatalist line of thought brings him into contact with this awful subject, and he describes the Deity as 'though 'not making sin,' yet, as if it were the next thing to it, 'not 'ceasing to make and multiply natures vitiated by sin, natures 'from which He has withdrawn His Spirit.'[1] The expression has the effect of bringing the Divine mind into some kind of vicinity to the production of evil, and throwing a responsibility upon it on that head: as if, though God did not create the principle of evil in the first instance, he voluntarily concreted it, and gave it that teeming and multitudinous life which it has in the existence of innumerable individual evil beings. Nor does Luther disguise the peculiar trial to his faith which this department of speculation brings: '*hic fidei summus gradus credere justum qui sua voluntate nos necessario damnabiles facit.*'

Such passionate and semi-sceptical thoughts cleared away, but only to leave Luther confronting, in their place, a most grave difficulty of Christian doctrine; for, upon the dogma of the absolute evil of man's goodness, a great difficulty immediately arises with respect to the doctrine of justification. How was man ever to be justified, and become acceptable to God, being, as he was, simply evil? The fundamental teaching of natural religion is, that man must recommend himself to God by some or other goodness, *bonâ fide* belonging to him: indeed, such a truth is no more than a mode of stating what natural religion is. The fundamental teaching of the Church Catholic has been the same: that is to say, the Church has always admitted good works into a regular place in the process of man's justification. But the Church has been enabled to do this from the circumstance that she has never annihilated the goodness of human works on account of their imperfection. She has all along taken a practical, common-sense ground on this subject, and has not allowed experimental disappointments of conscience, or speculative difficulties respecting infinity and perfection, to depreciate good works in her eyes. She has never been extreme and exigeant, or let her divines insist on some impossible perfection, in order that they may reduce all actions beneath it to a level. She has been ever moderate, gentle, and discreet, making allowances, and admitting approximations. The Church has therefore been enabled to maintain, with respect to man's justification, all the teaching of natural religion, and the whole language of reason; such as, that all who do their duty according to their light please God in their degree; that the least effort, be it only sincere, is acceptable; that all which, upon fair consideration, we pronounce to be good, or to partake of goodness, or to have something or other to do with goodness, in human conduct, all which is morally pleasing and commendable, is in its measure pleasing to God, and tends to make the doer pleasing to Him. But Luther annihilated all goodness in the first instance because it was imperfect;—he was, therefore, deprived of goodness as the means of justification; and therefore he had the difficulty to solve, how man could be justified at all.

---

[1] 'Licet enim Deus peccatum non faciat, tamen naturam peccato, subtracto Spiritu, *vitiatam, non cessat formare et multiplicare*, tanquam si Faber ex ligno corrupto statuas faciat. Ita qualis est natura, tales fiunt homines, *Deo creante et formante illos* ex natura tali.'—*De Serv. Arb.*, Op. vol. ii. p. 459.

Such was the climax of a long series of mental perplexities and troubles. One great absorbing difficulty brought them to a head—a human soul which was absolutely evil, and which could not, therefore, according to any existing method, be justified.

His difficulty now in clear and definite shape before him, Luther had to find a solution for it. He found one in the doctrine of Imputation. To compensate for his total denial of actual goodness in man, he threw himself upon the idea of an imputed goodness; intensifying and pushing out the imputed exactly to the amount which his denial of the actual required. The act of imputation, considered in the abstract, is of an extreme, simple, and arbitrary character, depending wholly on the imputer, and not at all on the person imputed to, and conferring the imputed thing or quality wholly irrespectively of conditions. As received and entertained, however, in the Church at large, this idea of imputation comes before us qualified by the conditions which natural religion imposes; and as natural religion does not allow of the notion that perfect righteousness can be imputed by God to men who have done nothing whatever but evil, the imputation which the Church teaches becomes necessarily a conditional act, dependent on the character of the person to whom the imputation is made. But Luther insisted on giving imputation the whole unqualified force of the abstract idea; that is to say, he pushed it out to the extent of its being absolute, and irrespective of the character of the person the subject of it. The one idea of imputation thus entirely met the difficulty which he had to meet; for, whereas his difficulty was that man had no goodness by means of which to be justified, here was a method of justification which required no goodness whatever in him. Here was the principle pronounced—and it was quite a new one in the Christian world—that the goodness of the person had nothing whatever to do with his being accounted good by God. Here was the moral quality or character in man altogether separated from his justification, declared to be alien and irrelevant, null and void with reference to it. 'The law was abolished, the whole law, moral 'as well as ceremonial,' and had no place or existence in the scheme of reconciliation. Luther had answered his question, how man was to be justified; and the difficulty of absolute evil on man's part had a complete and triumphant solution in the doctrine of absolute imputation on God's.

We have stated the fundamental point in Luther's system; but, in order to have a fuller idea of it, it will be proper to go a little farther, and see it in its working.

The righteousness of man, then, being a simply *imputed* one, in contrast with an *actual* state of absolute sin, the next step in the Lutheran system was to say that man individually appropriated that righteousness to himself, or was individually justified, when the idea of that imputed righteousness wholly expelled and effaced the sense of that actual sin. To achieve this transmutation was the triumph of Christianity in Luther's view, and he dwells and enlarges on it with untiring enthusiasm. On the one side indeed, was the world actual and cognizable declared to be wholly evil: human nature with its moral affections, tastes, and power of will, was so much mere flesh, the flesh which the Gnostic hated and anathematized; evil, rotten, and hostile to God. The very construction of human nature was against attaining goodness; goodness being always the further off the more it was pursued. Evil was evil, and issued such; and man 'was under the elements of this world,' and could not escape from its bondage. Such was the world actual and cognizable according to Luther. But his next step is, to tell us that with that world we have nothing to do; that all this evil is absolutely irrelevant, and that the perfect righteousness of Christ is, by imputation, our real state and condition all the time. This righteousness was indeed wholly external to us, wholly removed from our nature, conscience, life, and being; was in no sense an attribute of ourselves: we looked within and did not see it; our spiritual perception itself did not see it:

it did not appear; it was nowhere. Still it was ours: we had it: we were perfectly righteous with the perfect righteousness of Christ. *Intra conscientiam Diabolus: extra conscientiam Deus.* Luther insists particularly on the fact of this total separation between our life and consciousness and this righteousness, and also upon the total irrelevancy of that fact. 'Thou, brother, 'wishest to have visible righteousness; that is, thou wishest to 'feel righteousness, as thou feelest sin: this cannot be. Thy 'justice must transcend the sense of sin: and make thee '*believe* that thou art righteous in God's sight. Thy justice 'is not visible, is not sensible, but to be revealed in its own 'time. Thou must not judge, then, according to the sense 'of sin, which terrifies and disturbs thee; but according to 'the promise of faith whereby Christ is promised to thee; who 'is thy perfect and eternal righteousness.'—'Thou sayest, I 'do not perceive that I have righteousness; thou must not 'perceive, but believe that thou hast righteousness.' With tremendous energy he inculcates unceasingly this doctrine; that, as far as any moral existence, *i. e.* any moral evidences of existence in our hearts and minds, are concerned, we are not to think of them, with reference to this righteousness; that it has nothing to do with our moral nature, but that it does exist truly and absolutely nevertheless, and is our own. This is the great truth upon which we are to live. The believer has to think himself to be perfectly righteous, though he sees himself to be perfectly wicked. And this explains a phraseology to which we come in Luther's writings, and which at first considerably perplexes us. For after all this picture of the unmixed evil and sin with which our conscience is ever upbraiding us, Luther is often, and earnestly, impressing upon us this particular distinction with respect to sin;—that, though it must be felt somehow and by some part of us, the *conscience* must not feel it. Of all our faculties, the conscience specially is restricted from feeling sin. Now such a phraseology is incomprehensible at first; for it is something like telling us that objects must be seen, but that of all the organs and senses of our nature, the eye must not see them; or that sounds must be heard, but that of all our senses and perceptions, the ear must not hear them. Conscience is that faculty of which the particular function is to distinguish right and wrong, and convict us of sin if we have committed sin; and therefore if sin is felt at all, conscience must be the part which feels it. Upon examination, however, we see that this is only a strong form of speech for expressing the fact that the consciousness of internal sin must be absorbed and extinguished in the higher conviction of external righteousness. To express this, the conscience is described as itself becoming changed into this higher conviction: its nature inverted, it is imperatively required to be conscious of that of which it is not conscious, and not conscious of that of which it is conscious. Sin must not reign in the conscience, but be content with torturing the body; that is to say, the body which cannot feel it may feel it; the conscience which can must not. The language is equivalent to saying that sin may be perceived as a fact, but not as sin: it is the peculiar function of conscience to perceive it as sin, therefore conscience must not be allowed to entertain the perception of it at all: but a certain lower perception in our nature can see it as a fact, without being in the least troubled at it; and within the sphere of such perceptions it may be allowed to come. With the memento that man's righteousness, as being sin, and the law as producing sin, have the same unfitness with sin, to be objects of conscience; such appears to be the key to a large body of language we encounter in Luther. 'Conscience has nothing to do with the 'law, with works, or with human righteousness.' 'The law 'must remain *extra cœlum, i.e. extra cor et conscientiam.*' 'Suffer the law to reign over thy body, not over thy con'science.' 'The law hath dominion over the flesh; but if it 'wishes to occupy the conscience,' &c.—'The flesh should be sub'ject to the law, remain in its sepulchre, and be vexed by the 'Egyptians; but the conscience must be free.' 'In the state 'let the severest obedience to the law be exacted:'—*i. e.* because the state does not recognise sin as sin, but only as injurious to society, therefore the state may be alive to sin—but not the conscience. 'Let the conscience sleep joyfully in 'Christ, without the least sense of the law of sin and death.'—'When thy conscience is terrified with the law, and struggles 'with the judgment of God, then consult neither the law nor 'reason, but depend on grace alone, and the word of consolation. 'Then conduct thyself altogether as though thou hadst never 'heard of the law of God: ascend into the darkness, where is 'the light neither of law nor reason, but the enigma of faith 'only, which certainly decrees that thou art saved in Christ, 'beyond and outside of the law. Beyond and above the light 'of law and reason doth the Gospel take us, into the darkness 'of faith where the law and reason have no business.' 'Where 'there is fear and the sense of sin, death, wrath, and judgment; 'there there is nothing celestial, nothing divine.'—'But drown 'thy conscience in the wounds, blood, death, and resurrection 'of Christ.' 'Let the pious remember that in conscience 'they are free before God, from the curse of the law, though 'they are slaves to the law in the body.' The Old Testament is allegorized on this principle; and the conscience ascends with Isaac to the mount, the burden of the law remains with the ass below: conscience ascends with Moses, the law descends with him to be dispensed to the people below. 'Moses on the mount, 'when he speaks face to face with God, hath not, makes not, 'administers not, the law. But, having come down from the 'mountain he is a legislator, and governs the people with 'the law. In like manner let thy conscience be free from the 'law, but let thy body be subject to the law.' 'Let Moses 'remain on the earth, there let him be a doctor of the letter, 'an exacter of the law, a crucifier of sinners;—but for us, 'we have a new guest and a new house; Christ has come, and 'Moses, the old occupier, must depart and migrate elsewhere.' The meaning is under every form and turn of language, and there is not much variety even in that, exactly the same. Our conscience must be conscious alone of that which it does not see in us—righteousness; totally unconscious of that which it alone does see in us—sin.

Such are the two Lutheran worlds, or natures, of utter evil and absolute good; a perceptible and actual state of evil, an unperceived and imputed state of good; whereof the latter must wholly annihilate in idea and feeling the former, in order for the individual to be justified. The 'Law,' and 'Christ,' for these are respectively their two names, are antagonist principles opposed to each other with the intensity and fierceness of the two principles in the Eastern Dualistic philosophies;—'two contraries in irreconcilable war with each other;' and the triumph is when the former is destroyed. The 'Law' is horror, blackness, quaking, pallor, sadness, and despair; a 'dungeon,' a 'hell,' a 'sepulchre,' a 'torturer,' a 'butcher:' 'whoever saith he loves it, lies: that robber who loves his own 'dungeon, raves.' To this legislatorial principle 'Christ' is the antagonistic. '*Christus gigas potentissimus sustulit legem.*' Christ does not legislate, but kills law. He says to the 'Law,' *Ego ligabo te*, I will bind thee: Captivity, I will lead thee captive; Satan, I am thy Satan; I am the 'Butcher of the butcher,' and the 'Devil to the devil.'

And now we come to the power by which the believer was enabled to attain this victory, and wholly supplant this sin by this righteousness; that is to say, to the medium in the process of individual justification. Though all moral conditions were rejected, some medium or other it was necessary to have by which an evil nature was to lay hold of, and appropriate to itself, a perfect righteousness; as it could not be supposed that an evil being would become absolutely good in God's sight, without anything at all done on his side. The medium then laid down for this purpose was Faith. But it was faith of a particular character, which, in connexion with the system, should be noticed.

Faith, then, before it was allowed to occupy its position in the Lutheran process of justification, was carefully divested of all moral characteristics. There is a faith, which is in its very nature, akin to love or moral: but it was not this kind of faith which Luther made the medium between man and God in the act of justification. To have allowed any moral element in this medium, would have been to allow human goodness a place in the act of justification, which it was its first principle to avoid: and, therefore, he jealously and accurately guarded his faith from such admixture. He again and again inculcates and presses the distinction, that the faith which he means is *not* that faith which includes love; that it is a faculty of apprehension simply. 'That faith which apprehends Christ, *not* that 'which includes love, justifies.' 'Faith is *not* ineffectual till 'joined by charity.' He speaks of it as an insult to faith, and 'making it an empty quality in the soul,' to assert that it depended on the companionship of charity for its effect:—'as if,' he says, 'it could do nothing without *charity;* and when *charity* 'came, *then* was effectual, and *then* was justifying.' 'The 'Apostle attributes the operation (in justification) to faith and 'not to love.' 'Perish the sophists with their accursed gloss, '*Fides formata charitate:*' that 'impious gloss,' that 'pestilent 'gloss.' 'It is by faith sole, not by faith perfected in love, that 'we are justified.' 'Faith may be concreted in works after we 'are justified, but it is faith abstract by which we are justified.' The faith, then, which was the medium of justification in Luther's system, was an extra-moral faith. It was, as far as we can apprehend its nature, which it is not easy to do, the pure abstract faculty of confidence, whereby the mind assures itself of something of which it wants to be assured. As such, it is not untypical of Luther's temper; and the reader, who follows him through his career, or listens to his table-talk, or watches those symptoms of personal character which appear, as they often do, in his theological works, will catch many a trait, and sentiment, which may carry him back to his original dogma.

The great cardinal virtue in Luther's eyes was confidence. He had a special admiration, an enthusiastic affection for that particular faculty of mind, which makes a man inwardly strong and self-supporting. In the description of Adam before the Fall, in his Commentary on Genesis, he gives us his *beau idéal* of a man, and strength and self-confidence enter remarkably into it. Adam shows something of the Herculean model. Thus Luther dwells with animation upon his dominion over the beasts. He describes a character, bearing no slight resemblance to what in modern language we call a master-mind; one endowed with a mysterious power, marvellous self-respect, and instinctive command over others' wills and movements. Man in his primitive state is the *dominus terræ*, lord of the earth, not by labour, art, and cruelty, but by an innate power and will, to which the whole creation unconsciously bows; and he has this power, because he is true to himself, and feels no distrust within. But with the fall, this inward confidence goes, and all is altered: he shakes like a leaf; is full of terror and alarm, and startles even at the sound of God's approach. Then the beasts shake off their yoke, the earth becomes stubborn and disorderly, and cunning, toil, and misery, succeed to artless and majestic power. The Lutheran Adam is a superior creation to the Calvinistic Adam of Milton; but it is impossible not to see in the character the ruling taste in Luther's mind for the simple faculty of confidence, as the source of strength and happiness. On the contrary, distrust as to our condition, and where we stand, and how God regards us—the least apprehension, fear, and doubt, are simple misery and meanness with him. 'What is more miserable than uncertainty?' he asks again and again, as if Nature herself revolted from it:—that monster of 'uncertainty,' that 'pest of uncertainty,' 'which makes whatsoever thou thinkest, speakest, doest, sin.' How could a man be easy with such a disease upon him? How could he worship, how could he serve God the least? And all those texts of Scripture, which describe the confidence of the good and the fear of the wicked, 'The wicked flee when no man pursueth;'—'the wicked are like a troubled sea;'—'there is no peace for the wicked;'—'the righteous are bold as a lion:'—'he that doth evil hateth the light;'—'whatsoever is not of faith is sin;'—'the just shall live by faith,'—were interpreted in this particular sense.

The faith which was the medium in Luther's process of justification, was thus a pure and abstract faculty of confidence, which was efficacious in and out of itself. Believe that you are absolved, and you are absolved—was his teaching as a priest, before he broke from the Church—never mind whether you deserve absolution or no. He that believes is better than he that deserves. Always be sure that you are pleasing to God: if you are sure you are, you are. Feel yourself safe: if you feel safe, you are safe. On the contrary, if you doubt about it, you are condemned, because you are self-condemned. You are not in the image of God then, but in the image of the devil. Recollect yourself; make an effort; believe; be 'certainly resolved that you are in favour with God.' You are then a son of God and a saint; strong, perfect, and triumphant; you go forth like the sun in the heaven, and rejoice like a giant refreshed with wine. You have conquered the world, the flesh, and the devil, and have trodden hell and darkness under foot.

But this confidence, whatever apparent strength it might attain to, wanted, from the very hypothesis on which Luther's system was built, that reality and basis which Catholic faith has. All faith is, indeed, a sort of confidence; but the confidence of Catholic faith has this remarkable characteristic, that it appeals to positive fact for its basis. Human nature is not, according to Catholic theology, though brought by an incomprehensible mystery under a condition or state of evil, in a totally evil state. It still bears the stamp of its Divine original, has moral tastes and preferences, and a real power of performing acts of various degrees of moral goodness; has memorials of past and pledges of future perfection. Catholic faith, then, with respect to the unseen world, rests upon the actual facts of the seen. Proceeding upon data, it is a faith allied to reason, and not a blind faith. Man has some good in him, therefore he may one day be better, and an ultimate state of acceptableness in God's sight is made credible to him by the fact, that he can make some approaches to such acceptableness now. It is for the same cause, a faith allied to hope. For it is the peculiar characteristic of the faculty of hope to enlarge and advance upon fact as distinct from doing *without* fact altogether; existing fact given, hope can proceed upon it indefinitely; but some ground of fact it must have. The phrase, of 'hoping against hope,' does not suppose the total absence of all such ground, but only the reduction of it to the smallest imaginable quantum. Sailors wrecked in the middle of the sea hope for the sight of a sail, in proportion as they know their situation to be in some general line of navigation, know the traffic on that line to be considerable, know the time of the year to be the customary one for that traffic, and other like data: if they have no data at all for hope, they cannot legitimately hope. So far as faith and hope can be viewed as distinguished from each other, faith takes the negative, and hope the positive side: faith exerts her particular powers in opposing those appearances which are hostile; hope hers in enlarging those appearances which are friendly. Catholic faith, then, as it has existing fact to proceed upon, is a faith allied to hope; nay, so intimately allied, that hope practically precedes faith in the act of belief; and we believe because we hope, rather than hope because we believe: we see an actual ground, however small; hope expands this, and not till then we have faith.

Allied thus to hope and reason, Catholic faith is emphatically a natural kind of faith. It is not violent or forced: it has only to believe in the future expansion and perfection of that which it now sees. The Christian sees tendencies, and he has to believe in issues; he sees approaches, and he has to believe in fulfilments; he sees a foundation, and he infers a superstructure: he rises by a reasonable ascent from earth to heaven; the visible world contains the elements of the invisible; the kingdom of nature opens by a gradual process into that of grace. The very smallest act of our moral nature connects him by anticipation, with the 'glory which shall be revealed in him.' Though he cannot say, 'It is finished,' he can say, It is begun; and in that visible beginning has a solid substratum for the most inspiring belief. Thus, when the great philosopher of our own Church undertook the task of convincing an infidel age of the truth of religion, the line he adopted was that of calling its attention to present visible facts. He told men that they were moral beings, born with the love of virtue and hatred of vice, endowed with generous affections, and with the power of doing virtuous actions,—a power, which could be indefinitely increased by habit and self-discipline: and he proved, next, that this goodness was more or less rewarded. There were then tendencies, he said, which pointed of themselves to some ultimate completion. That which religion taught us did exist to a certain extent now; and, therefore, might exist to a much greater extent hereafter. That is to say, his was a philosophy of hope; it saw in the midst of the wildness and disorder of this present scene some facts which bore in one direction, and hope took up those facts, and enlarged them into a system.

But Luther had no present facts to appeal to according to his system. He had no tendencies and no approaches. And, therefore, though he recognized an unseen world of absolute good, and, in distinction to making evil of the essence of humanity, or irrevocably fixing and perpetuating it in us, pointed to a time when we should be perfectly righteous; and could say—*Justitia tibi parata est in cœlo:* 'in a future life, thou shalt be 'cleansed from all sin, cleared of all concupisence, be pure as 'the sun, and have perfect love:' this unseen world was deprived of all medium to connect it with the seen one, and, therefore, deprived of that evidence which constitutes the legitimate claim to our faith. Of two worlds, of absolute evil and absolute good diametrically opposed, he placed us in the one, and told us to believe in the other. But the natural question immediately arises, why should we? No system of evidences, either in the religious, or in any other department, can dispense with that primary law of all argument—how can we reason but from what we know? Let any basis of fact, however small, be allowed us, and we can build indefinitely upon it; but, if we have no fact at all, we have nothing to build upon. The faith of Lutheran theology was thus excluded, by the very fundamental principles of that theology, from the reasonable and natural type. The act of faith became rather one of mental power, by which a person, from pure force of will, made himself believe in what there was no ground to believe, than one of natural conviction. It was faith deprived of its membership with the other portions of our spiritual nature; faith without hope, as it was faith without love. Excluded from a reasonable and natural character, it was compelled to assume a fanatical one: faith became assurance. The task of the Christian was to work himself up by strong effort to the belief that he himself was personally saved, was a child of God, was in a state of justification. If the believer asked why, or how, he was to believe, he was told again, Believe; make yourself believe; believe somehow or other. He was urged with arguments enough, addressed to his mere will and sense of personal advantage; was threatened and promised; was told he would be intolerably wretched if he did not believe so, unutterably happy if he did; but ground of reason there was none. Assurance, thus left to assure itself as it could, became an anxious, struggling, and fluctuating gift. It rose and it fell with the state of the spirits, and even state of the body. It was at any moment liable to be upset, and when upset the will had to make another effort to regain it. These struggles, or 'agonies,' occupy a prominent place in the practical or devotional department of Luther's theological system. They are appealed to as the tests of the genuineness and reality of the Christian's belief. Has he been tempted to doubt and despair of his salvation, and has he had to make the most tremendous internal efforts to recover his certainty of it? these are the tokens which a loving but chastising Father sent him of good will and favour. They were the trials to prove him, and stimulants to raise him to a higher degree of assurance than ever. The same reason which gave Luther's faith a fanatical, gave it a personal and individual character too. Genuine faith, as it rests on a large external ground, is wide and social in its object, looks forward to the final issue of this whole system of things, the ultimate triumph of virtue over vice, to the great Day of Judgment and the Restitution of all things. But Luther's faith, as it narrowed its basis, narrowed its object too. Withdrawing from the wide ground of reason and nature, the unsupported faith of mere will, choosing to believe because it wished to do so; as it derived all its strength from the individual, interested itself about the individual only: and faith became, in its whole scope and direction, personal.

Such is that whole system which, amongst ourselves, goes under the name of Calvinism. It is, of course, wrong, historically speaking, to call Luther a Calvinist, because Luther preceded Calvin, and was the original discoverer of that set of ideas which Calvin only compacted and systematized. But, amongst ourselves, in consequence of our acquaintance having lain more with the Genevan than the German branch of the Reformation, these ideas are associated with the name of Calvin, and, therefore, amongst us, Luther's theology may be designated as Calvinism. No greater contrast, indeed, than that between the personal characters of the German and the Genevan Reformer can be well imagined, and the types of character they have handed down to their respective schools are widely distinct, but their theology is essentially the same.

To return to the point at which we diverged. Luther had now found the solution of his difficulty, and was satisfied. He had encountered a tormenting puzzle, and had now the answer. How could man fulfil the law, was the puzzle; By simple imputation, was the answer. The whole difficulties attending the adherence of evil to our nature, were now explained to Luther. The mystery of Conscience was solved. He had got his *εὕρηκα*. He dwelt upon it, now that he had got it, with deep and untiring relish; he handled it, and embraced it with perpetual mental fondness. He felt like a person possessed of a great secret, for which the whole world had been struggling from its creation, and never yet attained. He felt as Newton might feel when he had discovered the principle of gravitation; or as Harvey might feel when he had discovered the circulation of the blood; or as one of the elder sages might have felt had he discovered the *elixir vitæ*, or the principle of alchemical transmutation. He felt as one of those great philosophers of the ancient world might have felt when he discovered some great moral principle which explained the phenomena of human life, and disclosed the secret of human happiness, like Pythagoras, when he discovered Number; or Zeno, when he discovered Fate; or Epicurus, when he discovered Chance. Every one who has found out a riddle, or put a Chinese puzzle together, or solved a problem in geometry, knows the peculiar satisfaction which attends the climax of solution,—a satisfaction which is, of course, deeper in proportion to the depth and interest of the difficulty. Luther looked back with the feeling of a traveller at rest upon his past struggles and searchings. 'Can you tell 'me how to fulfil the law?' was the question he asked now, as if the difficulty itself were pleasing, because he felt in possession of the key to it. What is that impossible thing called righteousness which has tortured the human mind from the foundation of the world? Square that circle if you can. Find that ποῦ στῶ. He saw the whole world wandering in a maze on this subject,

> 'Errare atque viam palantes quærere vitæ,'

going round and round, and pursuing their own footsteps; arguing in a circle, and endeavouring to escape from sin by 'working righteousness,' which, when worked, only made them feel greater sinners than before. He saw a fatal error, affecting the very foundation of the Christian system, in undisturbed hereditary possession of the whole Christian world; and he saw in himself the person destined to subvert it.

There has been no Indulgence fair at Wittemberg, then, as yet, and no Tetzel, and yet Luther has started. As distinguished from being a mere practical Reformer in the first instance, led on incidentally to doctrine, he was primarily, as we said at the beginning of this article, a doctrinal Reformer, the founder of a new school, the propagator of an idea. He was one of that corps of creative minds who, whether as philosophers or as religionists, Pagan or Christian, have succeeded in permanently impressing their conceptions on large portions of society, and leaving intellectual fraternities behind them. He began with a course of dreaming and speculation. He brooded with keenness and passion upon the great mystery of our moral nature. One particular idea, the boldness of which suited the impatience of his mind, seemed to solve it; and he devoted himself to the promulgation of that idea. A period of four years, commencing with his first entrance into the Augustine Monastery at Erfurt, in 1505, carried on and completed this search and discovery of Luther. In 1509, on the recommendation of Staupitz, the Vicar-General of the Dominican order, upon whom Luther's trials and struggles, and the intellectual and religious energy they exhibited, had made a great impression, Luther received from the Elector of Saxony the appointment of Professor of Philosophy in the University of Wittemberg, accompanied with a most urgent and complimentary letter from that Prince. In a short time, he received from the Senate of Wittemberg the appointment of City Preacher. He regarded the appointment as an important opening for the promulgation of his great dogma, and was besieged with nervous alarm that he should not be able to turn it to the account he ought to do; but his success equalled his fondest hopes. He preached, by turns, in the Monastery, in the Royal Chapel, and in the Collegiate Church. 'His voice was fine, sonorous, clear, 'striking; his gesticulation emphatic and dignified.' He departed wholly from the established type of sermon, quoting, instead of the schoolmen, the Bible, especially St. Paul's Epistles. The degree of Bachelor in Theology enabled him to add to these sermons University lectures on the sacred text; and 'never, 'in any Saxon professional chair, was heard such luminous explanation.' He delighted in these lectures, and passed whole nights in preparing for them. 'Eminent doctors came to listen, 'and retired full of admiration. The venerable Pollich, known 'by the soubriquet of *Lux Mundi*, heard him, and struck with 'wonder, exclaimed, "This father hath profound insight, 'exceeding imagination; he will trouble the doctors before he 'has done."' In addition to his Academical posts, he was, by the appointment of his patron, Staupitz, made visitor of the monasteries in that province. In a letter to a friend, he writes, 'I 'had need of two secretaries to keep up my correspondence; 'pity my unhappy fortune. I am conventual concionator, table-'preacher, director of studies; I am vicar, or, in words, eleven 'priors in one; conservator of the ponds of Litzkau, pleader 'and assessor at Torgau, Paulinic reader, and collector of 'psalms; add to all these, the assaults of the world, the flesh, 'and the devil.' His reputation extended, and he preached in the castle at Dresden before Duke George. In 1516, he commenced the publication of a series of theses, which, under the cover of the disputative system of the day, attacked the established doctrines on the point of justification, and put forth those views of the exclusive necessity of faith, the inefficacy of works, and the slavery of the will, which it was the aim of all his future theological labours to establish. Five papers, *φωνᾶντα συνετοίσιν*, containing respectively, twelve, ninety-five, fifty, forty, and a hundred propositions, alarmed the old, and awakened the new intellect in the Church.

But the time now approached when Luther was to add the department of practical to that of doctrinal Reformer, and, taking his dogma along with him, to prepare the ground for its reception by an attack on a whole existing practical system. It is obvious that the teacher of a new doctrine cannot do his work extensively and zealously without becoming a practical man to do so. He is bound to attack what stands in his way, and occupies the ground, and he thus necessarily finds himself at war with a whole mass of existing interests and machinery; the doctrinal line necessarily leads into the practical. Such a practical line was, moreover, not at all uncongenial to Luther's character, even that internal and speculative part of it which is the only one we have as yet had before us. We have seen him a sort of dreamer, indeed, and a visionary; intent upon the difficulties of the spiritual and metaphysical world, and struggling with the great mystery of evil; but it is this visionary and internal line of thought which often produces the most portentous energy in action. Thus, the general alliance which has been observed between infidelity and radicalism, though the one is theoretic, the other practical. The French Revolution itself, with all its tremendous exhibition of practical power, issued out of a philosophy which seemed concerned only with the abstract universe, and to be discontented with the constitution of things. As we examine deeper, we discern the most intense passion involved in such speculation. The sensitive and keen temper moves in the department of philosophy, as if it were a dramatic sphere—perceives apparent defect and injustice in the system of the world – is angry, as if it had received a visible wrong and affront—and rushes into atheism out of revenge. And the same temper is, for the same reason, furious with respect to the abuses and grievances of the social and practical world. Luther's reveries upon the workings of the moral law, and the obstinacy of the evil principle in nature, how it pursued us, and found us out even in our best acts, fastened on us, and refused to be shaken off; accused, condemned, and humiliated us; that passionate and querimonious temper which felt the temptation to rebel against the system of things, on account of evil in the abstract, indicated just a mind most ready to break out, when the opportunity arrived, against the evils of the practical and concrete world, the abuses and grievances, the frauds and cheats, the pride of the great, and the insolence of the strong, which the established system of the day displayed.

If there ever was an age in which the external and working system of the Church was calculated to provoke and excite such a mind to action, it was the age in which Luther lived. It exhibited that peculiar mixture, so poignantly irritating to a keen temper, of the grossest abuses with the most placid and easy self-complacency in those who maintained, and were responsible for them. The Court of Rome allowed the lowest fraud and imposture in the working system of the Church, and suffered faith and reason to be shocked, itself all the while reposing in a superciliously intellectual, and even rationalizing philosophy. There is something in the honest belief in a system, however erroneous itself, which tends to soften and disarm a complainer; but it was rather too much for the Court of Rome to expect of a class of sensitive intellects, which were then rising up in the Church, that they were calmly to embrace all the lies of her practical system, while she herself did not believe them, and was laughing in her sleeve. There was impatience and self-will, doubtless, in the spirit in which the Continental Reformers raised and carried on their opposition; but Rome itself had certainly no right to complain of it. If they were guilty, she was not innocent, nor has she any right, on the field of controversy, to assume that position which she does, of having been sinned against without having sinned. The human mind was entering, then, on a new and mysterious stage of its history; and that great intellectual movement which has been steadily advancing ever since, and trying the world's faith in its progress, had begun. Rome herself partook largely of that revival. Did she bear the test well, and set the example so much wanted at the commencement of such a movement, of intellect not really opposing faith? or, dazzled herself, and carried away by the revival, did she set the whole world the very contrary example, of intellect undermining faith? Did she, when she headed that intellectual movement, teach the world how to bear it? We have the answer to the question in the accounts transmitted to us of a Papal Court which seemed, by some inebriation of the intellect, to have dreamed itself out of Christianity into paganism, ignored, by a sort of common consent, the Gospel Revelation, and instituted again the Groves of Academus. An elegant heathen Pope, who carried on Tusculan Disputations; Cardinals who adorned their walls with scenes from Ovid's Metamorphoses, and devoted themselves to Ciceronian Latin; and a whole scene of luxurious intellectuality in Rome, contrasted bitterly with the palpable superstitions and abuses of the out-of-doors world; and the centre of Christendom, putting itself quietly and unconcernedly *ab extra* to a whole system for which it was responsible, while it taught men to despise that system, provoked at the same time disgust and rebellion against its own hypocrisy. Nor did the intellectual movement of the age show better fruits in the morals than in the faith of the Roman Court. The morals of the Roman ecclesiastics were scandalous, and it was only a question whether their vices themselves, or the shamelessness with which they indulged them, was the worse feature.

We shall not dwell upon a scene with which our readers are already sufficiently familiar, that of the sale of Indulgences in Germany in the year 1517, conducted by the Dominican monk Tetzel. It is enough to say that it signally exhibited the impostures and abuses of that system. Coarse, bold, and brazen,—there is strong reason for adding, immoral,—Tetzel carried out the system with a swing, and, intent solely on performing his office with practical efficiency, hawked his commodity, in the perfect unconsciousness of vulgar zeal, in churches, public streets, taverns, and alehouses, like a spirited man of business. At a cross set up in the market-place, from which the Pope's arms were suspended, the auctioneer extolled the merits of his article, and announced that as soon as ever 'the money chinked' in

Tetzel's box, sin to that amount was forgiven; the crowd standing about with a mixture of fun and business, as it does in a fair. In the course of his rounds he came to Juterbock, four miles from Wittemberg. Luther's indignation rose as he surveyed the scene. He waited till the approach of All Saints' day brought a crowd of pilgrims to Wittemberg, and on the eve of that day fastened on the church doors ninety-five theses against Indulgences,—copies of which, accompanied with letters of remonstrance, he sent to Albert, Archbishop of Magdeburg, and Jerome, Bishop of Brandenburg, within whose jurisdiction the traffic was going on, and to the former of whom half the proceeds of it were farmed.

Luther now stood before the world as a Reformer; and, as such, the authorities of the Roman Church met him with one aim and policy. Some were for mild suppression; others for fierce suppression; but all were for simple suppression. It was a disturbance, and it must be put down. Tetzel himself erected a scaffold in one of the promenades of Frankfort; walked in procession to it with his insignia as inquisitor of the faith; preached a sermon; ordered the heretic to be brought forward for punishment; placed the theses on the scaffold, and burnt them. The view of Prierias, the Pope's Censor, who answered Luther from Rome, was, 'Dogs must be barking. O dear Luther, 'wert thou to receive from our lord the Pope a good Bishopric, 'thou wouldst sing smaller, and even preach up the Indulgence, 'which it is now thy pleasure to vilify.' 'It is high treason,' exclaimed Hochstraten, the Inquisitor of Cologne, 'against the 'Church to leave such a heretic alive another hour. Erect in'stantly the scaffold for him!' The general view of those in power, less passionately expressed, was essentially the same. Scultet, Bishop of Brandenburg, a man of mildness and finesse, in a civil answer to Luther's letter, commended his zeal, and admitted that there was occasion for it, but told him to be quiet. Leo himself, ever easy and good-tempered, after once persuading himself to take a serious view of the subject, and descending from his lofty contempt for both sides in the contest, saw no other line but the established and traditionary one of mere suppression. Such was the policy; and the policy suggested its own means. Luther must be possessed in person; the man must be got hold of. The Court addressed itself with a mechanical instinct to that one point. Form, gravity, decorum, kindness, were observed in the means; but Italian sagacity was clear as to the end, and knew that the best way to treat with a foe was to secure him first. Luther once in Rome, away from friends, and removed from sympathy and aid; ecclesiastical justice would have a comparatively easy task; and one of two alternatives must follow, either that he should not leave it at all, or leave it a vanquished and tamed man.

But Italian policy, however sagacious and clear, had in Luther a difficult foe to deal with, and Rome was destined to find its match. The only effect which the observation of this aim on the part of Rome had on Luther, was to excite in him, in addition to his original grievance, a deep and inexpressible indignation that it should be met in that way; that the only answer to a witness against wrong should be a move to incarcerate him. 'Was it not a shame that these people set so high a price 'upon him?' He saw himself regarded as vermin, to be trodden and stamped upon; as something whose proper fate was simple effacement; and the bitterness of a double wrong now invigorated and sharpened him for the contest. There mixed with this indignation no slight disdain at the idea that such a line of proceeding should be supposed at all probable to succeed with him. Awake to those vast energies which were fast rising into life within him, and full of conscious power, he resented, while he despised, the audacity of men who could presume to imagine that *he* was to be caught by such strategics. Did they think him a simpleton, or what were they thinking of, to think that a possible thing? A mortal jealousy of Italian subtlety only put him the more on his mettle, and inflamed him. Luther was peculiarly of that temper which has a horror of being taken in, and is haunted by the '*decipi turpe est.*' The Italian was by national character and careful cultivation a diplomatist. He had that character, especially in Germany. The German felt himself no match for him, and retaliated by dislike and suspicion. The dread of an Italian was proverbial; an undefinable notion of his unlimited powers of deception pervaded the mass, and one German warned another as he approached. He was advancing now to the contest with his practised penetration, his easy address, his whole art and science of management; and he promised himself an easy victory over the poor simple German. Luther's gall rose at the idea. Would he find it so easy? and would he find him quite so poor simple a German? Why should not a German assume the Italian for once, and establish some small pretension to tact and policy? It seems to have been in connexion with feelings like these that Luther gave himself that *carte-blanche* for dissimulation which he used throughout all the stages of his struggle with Rome in which dissimulation was wanted. He certainly did meet the Italians here with their own weapon. He stuck at no disguises, no professions of humility, affection, reverence, and modesty, which simple language could supply, whenever his position called for them. Passion indeed is the prominent feature in Luther's character, and it does not appear at first sight as if passion and dissimulation would well go together; but they often do. Dissimulation is, after all, only a tool for accomplishing an object; and passion, which is clear-sighted enough to see this, will make use of that tool as it makes use of others. It will feel a relish in the employment of it, just as it will in the directly martial and openly hostile exercises of its calling, and even exult and triumph in it, in proportion as it is alive to its peculiar efficacy. Indeed, dissimulation will thus become a positive expression of passion; its success affords the most pungent gratification which there is to scorn, and passion specially delights in scorn; the deceiver feels that in deceiving he humiliates and degrades. Luther was as powerful a dissembler as he was an assailant. Formed just on the most formidable model in the whole workshop of character, with a degree of passion which would have driven any ordinary mortal into madness, he combined a perfect mastery and control of it, which converted it into a tool. An easy skill and a strong hand turned it about at pleasure. He did what he liked with it. He rode it as a skilful equestrian rides his high-mettled horse. He played with it as a conjuror plays with his balls, jerking and recalling them at will, and keeping them tossing in the air about him, but still obedient to the centre of attraction in himself. 'I never write so well,' he said, 'as when I am angry.' But the change from superciliousness to deference, from rage to flattery, from hatred to affection, was ready at a moment's notice, and the instrument always gave the proper note at a touch.

With these general lines of policy prepared on both sides, hostilities commenced. The first act was a citation from the Pope to Luther to appear personally, within sixty days, at Rome. The indictments were framed; an ecclesiastical court was appointed to try his case; and the only thing wanted was the presence of the offender. 'I saw,' says Luther, 'the thunderbolt launched against me: I was the sheep that muddied 'the wolf's water. Tetzel escaped, and I was to let myself be 'eaten.' Thrown upon himself, and confronted with imminent danger thus immediately in the contest, Luther met the emergency with the utmost coolness and self-possession. There is not a symptom of its ever having entered into his head to obey the citation; whatever happened, he had made up his mind that he would never let himself be dragged to Rome. But the resoluteness of the determination betrayed itself by no word of violence or pride. A letter from the University of Wittemberg, with many expressions of deep reverence for the Holy See, interceded for its professor, who, 'on account of the state of his 'health, and the dangers attending the journey, was not able to 'undertake what he would otherwise be most anxious to do;' adding, 'Most holy father, our brother is indeed worthy of 'credit: and as for his theses against Indulgences, they are 'merely disputatory. He has merely exercised his right of 'debating freely, and has asserted nothing.' An arrangement entered into at the same time with the Elector Frederick, that the latter should decline to give Luther a safe passport to Rome, supplied him with a still more efficient and respectable excuse.

The next attempt on the part of the Papal Court was conducted by a Nuncio in person. Cardinal Cajetan was at this time in Germany, returning from an unsuccessful mission on which he had been sent for exciting a war against the Turks. He was commissioned to undertake Luther's case, and received summary instructions 'to get hold of him, keep him safely, and 'bring him to Rome.'[1] An honest, vehement man, without the ordinary tact of an Italian envoy, he was accompanied by an *attaché* who in some measure supplied his deficiency, Urban di Serra Longa, an Italian courtier, whose long residence in a diplomatic character in Germany had familiarized him with the national character, and made him a peculiarly fit man for dealing with a German. The Cardinal cited Luther to Augsburg; and Luther went, receiving warnings at every step to be on his guard against the sly Italians. John Kestner, of Wittemberg, provisor of the Cordeliers, was full of apprehension for his brother—'Thou wilt find Italians at Augsburg, brother, who 'are learned folks, subtle antagonists, and will give thee a great 'deal of trouble. I fear thou wilt not be able to maintain thy 'cause against them; they will throw thee in the fire, and con'sume thee in the flames.' Doctor Auerbach, of Leipsic, repeated the note of warning—'The Italians are not to be trusted.' Prebend Adelmann, of Leipsic, repeated it after him. There was small need for impressing it upon Luther. Arrived at Augsburg, he was waited on by Serra Longa, who took the line of advising him, as a sensible man, to submit himself to the Cardinal without reserve. 'Come,' he concluded, 'the Cardinal is 'waiting for you. I will escort you to him myself. Fear 'nothing; all will be over soon, and without difficulty.' Luther heard him with respect, and expressed himself as perfectly ready to meet the Cardinal; but he wanted one thing before doing so—a safe conduct. 'A safe conduct? Do not think of asking 'for one; the legate is well disposed, and quite ready to end 'the affair amicably. If you ask for a safe conduct, you will

---

[1] 'Bracchio cogas atque compellas, ut eo in potestate tuâ redacto eum sub fideli custodiâ retineas, ut coram nobis sistatur.'

'spoil your business.' The *attaché's* assurance was confirmed by the rest of the Cardinal's suite: 'The Cardinal assures you 'of his grace and favour;' 'the Cardinal is a father, full of compassion.' Luther expressed no distrust in him, but wanted a safe conduct.

The safe conduct came, and Luther presented himself before the Cardinal, secure and humble. Prostrating himself first, he waited for one command to raise him to his knees, and another to raise him to his legs. After a silence, in which the Cardinal expected him to speak, but Luther humbly waited to be addressed, the conference commenced. Cajetan was stern, brief, and summary, and simply demanded retractation. Luther required argument to prove that he was wrong. For several successive interviews the same game went on, and Luther suggested argument, and the Cardinal repelled it. As Luther, however, remained cool, while the Cardinal became angry and heated, the balance of the discussion at last inclined in the former's favour, and he caught the Cardinal in a trap,—one sufficiently frivolous, indeed, but according to the technical laws of logic acknowledged in that day, decisive argumentatively. One of Luther's objectionable theses was, that 'the treasure of Indul- 'gences was not composed of the merits and sufferings of our 'Lord Jesus Christ.' The Cardinal asserted this to be flatly contradictory to the *extravagante* of Pope Clement. Luther challenged him to prove it, and the challenge was caught eagerly. The *extravagante* was produced and read, till they came to the words 'the Lord Jesus Christ has *acquired* the trea- 'sure by his sufferings.' 'Pause there,' said Luther. 'Most 'reverend father, be good enough carefully to consider and 'reflect on that phrase, "He has *acquired*." Christ has acquired 'a treasure by his merits; the merits, therefore, are not the 'treasure; for, to speak with philosophers, the cause is different 'from the things which flow from it.' Cajetan had committed a mistake in being enticed into an argument, and did not regain his position.

Luther, having puzzled the Cardinal, and done all he had to do; having noticed, too, symptoms of irascibility in his judge, from whom he began to receive first offers and then threats of a safe conduct to Rome, resolved to take his leave; leaving with his friends, first, a note to the Cardinal, explaining that the smallness of his resources did not allow him to protract his stay in Augsburg; and, secondly, an appeal to the Pope, whereby the Cardinal's hands were tied, and any retaliatory sentence to which his offended dignity might incline him, stopped. Before the morning light he mounted a horse, issued out of a small gate in the city, which a town-councillor had directed to be open for him, and left Augsburg at a gallop. His feelings on his return to Wittemberg were those of bitter merriment, not softened by the sight, which he then for the first time had, of the written directions contained in the Pope's brief to the Cardinal. 'The Cardinal would fain have had me in his hands, 'and sent me to Rome. He is vexed, I warrant, that I have 'escaped him. He fancied he was master of me in Augsburg; 'he thought he had me; but he had got the eel by the 'tail.'

The issue of the conference at Augsburg was a disappointment at Rome; the fault was thrown upon Cajetan's stiffness and asperity, and care was taken that the next Nuncio should be a different man. Charles Von Miltitz, Chamberlain to the Pope, was a German, in itself a recommendation; he was also a man of an open, frank exterior, and abundance of *bonhomie*. He and Luther met at Altenburg, on the 5th of January, 1519, spent several convivial days together, and were mutually charmed with each other's company, good-humour, and jocularity. The tone of Miltitz was most grateful to a man in Luther's position: 'You are drawing all the world away from 'the Pope: as for taking you to Rome, an army of twenty 'thousand would not be able to do it; you now are three to one 'against us.' He laughed over the incidents of his journey, and told good stories. '"What think you of the Roman seat '[see]?" I asked one of the hostesses on my road. "Seats," said she, "how should I know; are they wood or stone?"' The time passed pleasantly away, and the two excellent friends parted with embraces, and on Miltitz's side with tears. 'I did 'not,' said Luther, in writing to a friend, 'let it be seen that 'I thought the kiss Judas's kiss, and the tears crocodile's tears. 'The impostor, the liar! He has in his pocket seventy apostolical briefs, for leading me bound and captive to that murderous Rome.' Miltitz retired from this and a subsequent meeting with the notion that he had completely brought Luther round, and made him consent to silencing conditions. But the conditions were nugatory ones. Luther consented to declare himself an obedient child of the Roman See; and consented to promise that he would invite the people to be as obedient as himself; he consented to be silent if his opponents were silent, and finally consented to the appointment of some Archbishop as his judge. The three former conditions are on their very surface trifles: with respect to the last one, he did not care who judged him, so long as the judge came to Luther in Germany, and Luther had not to go to him at Rome. The Nuncio was as completely cheated as he wished to cheat; and Luther from his first reflection on the commencement of the conference, 'I know the fox,' to the concluding one, 'The farce is over,' showed an expertness of dissimulation, for which, in an untutored and inexperienced man, even the shrewdest diplomatist could be pardonably unprepared.

Meantime, as regards the reforming movement itself, the greatest caution was exercised in the mode of conducting it. To such a degree, indeed, did Luther carry his caution with respect to his theses, the subject of all these conferences, that he would not formally admit that they were expressions of his own opinion at all. They were theses, subjects suggested for disputation, and upon which theologians were invited to exercise their argumentative power and skill. Some might take one side, some another; he had never asserted which side he himself took upon each of these ninety-five. That he had a general objection to the present mode in which Indulgences were given was indeed obvious, but he had asserted no doctrine. Thus adroitly availing himself of existing machinery, he nurtured the first tender seed of the Reformation underneath the shelter of the old disputative system. Again, as he was not responsible for the theses themselves, so neither was he for their publication. He had stuck them on the doors of the church of All Saints at Wittemberg, the usual process in announcing subjects for disputation; but who copied them thence, or how it was they were now circulating through all the towns of Germany, he had no idea. He had not done it; if others had, he could not help that. 'Is all this noise made,' he writes in his first letter to the Pope, after the publication of his theses, 'because I have simply 'exerted my right as a master of theology, and disputed in the 'public schools? Why, this is done in all universities, and 'these disputes take place on much more sacred subjects than 'indulgences. What fate brings my poor disputations into so 'much greater prominence than those of other masters in 'theology, and makes them circulate all the world over, is a 'miracle to me. I only published them for the sake of our 'people here; and how the mass understand a set of questions, 'put enigmatically and obscurely, as disputative ones always are, 'is incomprehensible to me. . . . . What can I do? I am 'not able to recall them from circulation now, however their 'circulation may annoy me. I find myself brought reluctantly 'before the world, and exposed to every sort of criticism; an 'unlearned, dull, ignorant man is scrutinized by an age of cultivation and science, which could drive Cicero himself into a 'corner. It is my fate to be the goose hissing among the 'swans. . . . . . . All I can do is to prostrate myself at 'your feet—*vivifica, occide; voca, revoca; approba, reproba, ut* '*placuerit.*'

Again,—'I have nothing I can do: I cannot bear your 'anger, and how to rescue myself from it I know not. I am 'asked to recall my theses. If that would do any good I would 'do it immediately. But the truth is, that, owing to the 'opposition they have met with, they are circulating more 'widely than I ever dreamed of, and have taken such powerful 'hold of many minds, that they cannot be recalled. Nay, in 'this age of intellect and learning, it would be an injury to the 'Church of Rome herself to recall them, and that is the very last 'thing which, as a reverential son of the Roman Church, I could 'do.' The attitude which Luther assumed towards the Pope was that of a person who found a great stir of opinion going on, over which he had no control, and which he rather regretted than not. His expressions as to himself, the most debasing which language could produce, confirmed this attitude. 'Refuse of 'mankind, and dust of the earth, necessity alone is my excuse 'for presuming to address your Blessedness. Deign to lower 'the ear of your Blessedness to the bleatings of your lamb. 'The lowest and vilest of mankind, wretched and poor, I 'prostrate my unworthy self at your feet.'

We approach, in this latter specimen indeed, one whole class of expressions, which specially arrests the eye of the reader of Luther's life, and upon which some notice seems required. Luther always described himself as having begun his reforming career under an all but intolerable weight of dejection, the consequence of his own low idea of himself, and exalted reverence for the system and the men whom he found himself opposing. 'I began in great fear and trembling,' he tells Erasmus. 'Who 'was I then, poor, miserable, contemptible brother that I was, 'more like a corpse than a man; who was I to set myself up 'against the majesty of the Pope, before whom trembled not 'only the kings of the earth, and the whole world, but also, if 'I may so say, heaven and hell? No one can know what my 'heart suffered in those first two years, and into what depression, I might say into what despair, I was plunged. . . . I was 'not so joyous, so tranquil, so confident of success. There 'were, it is true, many pious Christians whom my propositions 'pleased much, but I could not consider them as mouth-pieces 'of the Holy Ghost: I looked only to the cardinals, the bishops, 'the theologians, the jurisconsults, the monks, the priests. . . . It 'was thence I expected the Spirit to breathe upon me. . . . . 'I did honour the Pope's Church from the bottom of my heart 'as the true Church. . . . . Had I despised the Pope, I should 'have trembled to see the earth open and swallow me up alive, 'like Corah.' With such signs of deep humility and respect for authorities did Luther conduct the Reformation through its early stages, and the question which naturally occurs is, how much of it was real, and how much of it not. The answer to such a question is provided for us by that science of character, which an increasing general experience of the various forms of character, subtle as well as simple, has now made comparatively easy and plain. It is quite safe to say, in the first place, that Luther's mental abasement before the Pope and Cardinals was partly real and partly unreal; and it is equally safe to say, in the second place, that where reality and unreality divide the ground, the unreality almost necessarily predominates over the reality. Luther had, to use a word of commmon parlance, a strong element of 'Jesuitism' in his nature. Without saying what at the time he did not think or feel, he could throw himself artificially into states of mind, out of which such thoughts and feelings proceeded. To a mind midway between two systems, an old one to which it had belonged, and a new one to which it was just going to belong, the present ground did not wholly extinguish the past one. Minds cannot absolutely annihilate their former state; and if there was a corner in which the old feeling existed in Luther's mind, it is the characteristic of such a mind to be able to summon it forth, and use and expand it upon occasion. The insincerity of such a mind rather lies in voluntarily, and with politic aim, exaggerating and inflating some real particle of feeling, than in feigning one which simply does not exist. Luther, in moulding his attitude to Rome, threw himself into a state of mind in which he 'thought the Cardinals, theologians, jurisconsults of Rome, the mouth-pieces of the Holy Ghost;' *i.e.* he allowed the imposing and magnificent characteristics of the Roman system to have their effect upon him, and impress him for the time that such an impression was wanted. An act of the will produced an attitude of feeling; and a species of humility arose, so subtle, mixed, and evasive, that an observer can hardly catch it with sufficient distinctness to pronounce accurately what it was. We notice the same fine and intangible character in his apology for that part of his conduct which showed apparent want of humility: the appearance being admitted and thus explained:—'Truth will gain no more by my modesty than it will lose by my presumption. ..... Who does not know that nobody puts forward a new idea without appearing to manifest some pride? ..... The Bishops begin to perceive that they ought to have done what I am doing, and they are ashamed. They call me proud and audacious, and I do not deny that I am so. But they are not men to know what God is and what we are.'

To this general *rationale* of Luther's reverence for the Pope, Cardinals, and Roman Church, must be added the liberty which the religious journeyer sometimes takes of expressing to the full his adherence to the old system, till he has consummated his transition to the new. Luther certainly expressed the fullest loyalty in public for the Roman system, at a time when it was impossible he should, and when, as a matter of fact, he did not feel it. On the 3d of March, he wrote to the Pope:—'Before God and his whole creation I testify, that I have 'never wished, and do not wish now, to touch by any means or 'craftiness your power, or that of the Roman Church, but confess 'fully that that Church is supreme over all, and that nothing 'in heaven or earth, save our Lord Jesus Christ only, is to be 'preferred to it.' On the 12th of the same month he wrote to his friend Spalatin:—'I know not whether the Pope is 'Anti-Christ in person or his apostle.' If asked, he would probably have justified the opposition between these two passages, on the ground that the one was public and the other private, and that they suited respectively the two sides of his position.

Such was Luther's policy at the commencement of his career. Let no one refer to the success of that career as an instance of success attending simple boldness and impetuosity. Luther was always the politician, and a resolutely cautious one. With a boldness equal to facing the blindest hazard, he never moved without a definite pledge of security. He obstinately insisted on safe conducts. '*Vivat Christus, moriatur Martinus,*' he exclaimed on his journey to Augsburg; but he took care to meet Cajetan with a safe conduct in his hands. 'I will go there, 'though I find as many devils as there are tiles on the house-'top,' he said, before his journey to Worms: but he took care that an imperial herald conducted him there. He proved the saying, that fear mixes largely with true courage, and that the better part of valour is discretion. Follow him step by step, and you see him the shrewd diplomatist, parrying invitations, rejecting offers, penetrating disguises. By this course of policy he kept himself out of Rome and in Germany. He kept himself among sympathizing and admiring friends, preaching, writing, and talking, and disseminating his ideas in every way. He gained time for the formation of a party. His popular winning character only required the congenial national sphere to act in, to make itself felt; and to be in Germany was to grow and prosper. 'Martin,' says a contemporary, who is describing him at this period of his life, 'is of the middle height; cares and 'studies have made him so thin, that one may count all the 'bones in his body; yet he is in all the force and verdure of his 'age. His voice is clear and piercing: he is never at a loss, 'and has at his disposal a world of thoughts and words. In his 'conversation he is agreeable and easy, and there is nothing hard 'or austere in his air. He permits himself to enjoy the plea-'sures of life. In society he is gay, jocund, and unembarrassed; 'and possesses a perfect serenity of countenance despite of the 'atrocious menaces of his enemies.' The sweetness and fascination which mingled with the power of his character sent away the crowds, who came to Wittemberg from curiosity, disciples and propagandists: their reports brought other crowds, and Wittemberg became the sacred city of the new school. As the young student of a distant province caught the first sight of the spires of Wittemberg, he raised his hands to heaven and praised God that He had made the light to shine on that city, as He had before upon Sion. The disputative exhibitions of the day aided him. They kept up excitement, and supplied public and striking scenes in which Luther appeared to remarkable advantage. All the talent and literature of the day crowded to those disputations; they were the amusement of the intellectual world; people came from the greatest distances; there was a general contact of minds, and the formation of a public opinion was the result. It was at one of these scenes that Melancthon was gained. The great disputation at Leipsic brought together all the young theologians of Germany, and Luther did immense execution. Pitted greatly to his advantage against the sharpest, noisiest, most vain, impudent, and unscrupulous disputant of the age, he won at one morning many of the subsequent lights of the Reformation. Thus serviceable with respect to the mass, the same interval was equally serviceable in gaining over nobles and princes too. Luther moved in an age in which not the many but the few governed; under the surveillance of German Electors, Dukes and Landgraves, who had no interest in his doctrines except a selfish one, and who were bound to watch with some jealousy, however welcome he might be as an opponent of the Pope, the career of a popular leader and mover of masses. The moderation and caution of Luther's opening policy was just the feature to recommend him to them. Had he shown himself a mere agitator and addresser of masses, he would have stood in an unfavourable attitude towards the Courts. They would have distrusted and disliked him. Summary suppression is the frequent fate of agitators: it was the fate of John Huss and Jerome of Prague; and the German princes would probably have stood by with considerable indifference and seen Luther carried off by some Papal Envoy, had he shown himself only an agitator as those early Reformers had. But they saw in Luther the politician and the diplomatist, and they respected him. He had sympathies with Courts and Governments as well as with masses; he had obvious weight and solidity; he had the stamp of practical power upon him; he had all the appearance of one who could found, and fix, and not only preach a theology. The consequence was that they took to him. The Elector Frederick, his own sovereign, a timid and wavering man, who would have been offended at any spectacle of simple vehemence and passion, was his firm friend, and a considerable body of princes were resolved to see fair play.

The time now came when the fruits of this policy appeared, and when Luther, throwing off all disguise, and breaking fairly with the Pope, was enabled to take his stand confidently on the ground which he had made. In the April of 1521, Luther, having already committed the overt act of rebellion, and burnt the Pope's Bull publicly at Wittemberg, appeared to take his trial before the Diet of Worms. No contrast can be imagined greater than that between Luther's whole figure and position, as it actually was now, and what it would have been had any precipitancy or carelessness handed him over prematurely to the Roman power. Tried prematurely in his career, and tried at Rome, he would have stood before his Roman judges a criminal at the bar; a disturber and breaker of the peace, little more respectable than a common highwayman. As it was, he appeared more as a conqueror than a criminal; the very scene which was intended to suppress him was his greatest elevation, and his condemnation established him in the position of a successful and recognised Reformer. With a safe conduct,—in the circumstances in which he was inviolable—he presented himself secure, erect, and self-possessed: he could not be touched; he was a dignified spectator of the august ceremonial; the great man whom it really honoured; he was received in state, and treated almost like an independent potentate, within the Imperial assembly. Between his position and that of his ill-fated predecessor John Huss, there was all the difference that there is between a prisoner and a visitor: Huss went to the Diet at Prague to be tried; Luther went to Worms to pay his respects. His journey to Worms was a triumphal march. Every step brought him across some flattering marks of sympathy and respect, public and private. As he passed from town to town, burgomasters and councillors vied in their hospitality, and crowds gazed at him with wonder. On arriving at Worms, princes, nobles, and students flocked around him. He entered the hall of trial and saw his friends on all sides. The greatness of the occasion oppressed him indeed at times, and in private he had moments of that dejection and nervousness which nature itself feels when going to figure in extraordinary scenes. Simple conspicuousness is oppressive;

and to sustain the full gaze of such an assembly, and go through the ordeal of question and answer, in a way which became Luther's position and pretensions, required all Luther's courage and confidence. But his real position was already made, and now he had only to act up to it: for a whole week he was pressed by the assembled Diet to recant; for a whole week he repeated his refusal. An imperial edict then placed him under the ban of the empire, and the ceremonial was over. Nobody thought of obeying the edict, and the terrible sentence which consigned him to imprisonment, and forbade anybody harbouring and feeding him, passed off as a farce. Luther, after a temporary residence in the Elector's castle at Wartburg, returned to Wittemberg, preached, wrote, published, and superintended the formation of his own Church. The next year's Diet at Nuremberg exhibited the Papal power in a state of such deplorable feebleness, that it seemed to have enough to do to fight for its own safety without aspiring to conquest. Cheregat, the Papal legate, met the assembly with language such as Rome had never before been known to use, of the most humble and sad confession. He acknowledged that the Church wanted reform, and the see of S. Peter first and principally: Rome had been guilty of profaneness, oppression, and all scandals, and reform should therefore descend from the head to the members, and purify the Church at large by purifying its centre. Elevated by this language, the Diet drew up its *centum gravamina* against the Roman See, and with much bitterness of tone demanded redress. A feeble call for an execution of the edict of Worms was quashed at once by several of the princes, and a prostrate Papacy gave Luther not only safety but triumph.

In reviewing the external causes which fixed the Reformer in such a strong position, we find an intellectual and a religious one. The young and fresh intellect of the day was mainly with Luther. Progress was the word; it was the thing to go after him; Luther was all the fashion. A bold original mind, by the side of the cut-and-dried cleverness, technicality, and hackneyed disputativeness of the old theology, captivated especially the young: it seemed as if people who held back from him owed an apology to the intellectual world, and had to show cause why they should not be set down as, however worthy and well-meaning, a sadly dull, old-fashioned class. People see the intellectual defects of an old familiar system, and not those of a new and strange one, and rush into novelty in order that they may enjoy the sensation of possessing truth, free from all accompanying sensation of drawbacks. Moreover, the argument on the side of his opponents in support of the old system was contemptibly feeble. On the great and fundamental question, which the dispute instantly brought up, viz. who was the judge of controversies of faith, Luther had a really strong ground, and intellectual men saw it. It was a ground, indeed, simply negative, and on that very account a much easier one to maintain than that of his opponents; but, as a negative argument, it was irresistibly strong: he asked them to prove that the Pope was this judge—and that the Roman Catholic could not prove. It was plain that the latter's ground was weak here, and Luther had only to ask his question in order to manifest and bring out that weakness. He retired from the disputation with the appearance of a person who knows he has given a challenge which cannot be answered, and demanded a proof which cannot be given. It added to the strength of this negative position, that the other side were so wholly unprepared for encountering it: the Papal monarchy was a first principle with Luther's opponents; they had never reasoned, or thought it necessary to reason about it; it stood on a par with Christianity itself; the fact had grown up with their growth, and was part of themselves; their minds simply reflected an established system, and could not put themselves *ab extra* to it, as argument requires. When they had brought Luther to deny the authority of the Pope, they went away pleased and triumphant, as if they had gained a plain *reductio ad absurdum.* But it was impossible that the excited intellect of a new school of thinkers should not see the absence of real argument on such a question. The abuses of private judgment have sometimes naturally warped the intellect in favour of the Papal claims, but the abuses of the Papacy then exposed it to the examination of a not only impartial, but unfriendly intellect. An unfriendly intellect was a rigid one, and demanded argumentative proof; and that proof not being forthcoming, an intellectual triumph was on the side of him who gave the challenge, and an intellectual defeat on theirs who had not answered it. The puzzler, the questioner, was the victorious party; and Luther represented immediately the intellect of the day, the spirit of inquiry and criticism, which, not content with existing facts, required an explanation of them, and went back to first principles. Of two parties who were combating, one examined, the other simply asserted, and aimed at silencing its opponent by that simple force of assertion: the sympathies of the intellectual spirit were enlisted in favour of the inquirer, and against his dogmatic silencer.

Again, a religious reason operated in fixing Luther in his position. Whatever amount of religion there might be going on within the Roman Church of that day, and whatever aggregate of good and holy men there might be, actually and numerically in her, this religion did not come to the top, and take its proper leading place. The Church, acting as a whole, and exhibiting herself, in her central government, through her officials and mouthpieces, in her managing and ruling parties, showed lamely, in a religious point of view, before the world. The profligacy of the ecclesiastics of the Roman Court itself was notorious: and the Bishops at large had managed to raise against themselves a strong popular charge of pride and luxury, which it is impossible for the fairest reader of history to overlook. The particular men whom the Papal Court sent from time to time to confront Luther showed the defect; they were clever, active, shrewd, and elegant men, who had mixed with courts, and who had taken part in the literary revival of the age. Cajetan was a serious, indeed, though an ordinary man; but Miltitz, a sly convivial courtier; Eck, a vain and bustling disputant; Aleandro, the nuncio at the Diet of Worms, a literary star, whose life had passed in the thick of the attractions, the display, and the laurels of the *Renaissance;* Campegio the lawyer, and others, were men simply cut out on the model of the world of their day. So were Prierias, Emser, Murner, and a whole class of second-rate controversialists. But Luther was obviously not a man of this mould; his was a powerfully and strikingly religious mind. Whether his religion were a true one or not, he had one; he lived for its sake; he was full of it; it inspired, strengthened, and stimulated him, and made him what he was. He stood before men like a being from another world; possessed of an intensity of religious belief and ardour to which ordinary men had nothing comparable; and which the world gazed upon as it does upon any transcendental phenomenon. Out of the whole ecclesiastical corps of the day, not a man was to be found who could meet him on this ground. Everybody knows the great weight and influence of 'signs' in the religious department: people have always sought after signs, and always will. By signs we mean prominent facts or phenomena, which admit of being supposed to be tokens from above, and suggest that supposition to anxious minds. Such signs, though they depend wholly on supposition, more or less natural, and not at all on argument, for their weight, have still often far greater weight than any argument: they belong to the present and the actual; the immediate manifestation of God's will by a sign is more attractive than that which takes place through the ordinary mediums. And under the head of signs come not only positively miraculous and unaccountable facts, but all striking facts whatever, all appearances, postures of affairs, which admit of having some or other particular significance attached to them by the mind. In this sense the absence of religion at the head-quarters of the Church was a serious 'sign' to a large class of religious minds in Luther's days. Luther, on the other hand, was a striking phenomenon of the religious class; an instance of a man possessing, and communicating, the most powerful religious convictions. The religious reason thus came in, and Luther gained numbers on the ground that he seemed to have earnestness on his side, while the Church was worldly and secular. A marvellous combination of the worldly politician and deep religious enthusiast, Luther was confronted by the talent and tact of commonplace men, and he rode over it easily and triumphantly. Legate after legate, and diet after diet broke down before him; they could do nothing; he had it all his own way. He succeeded, for the plain reason that there was not in the whole of Christendom his match, and that the greater man, like the greater momentum, naturally prevails. What, indeed, must have been the prostration of the Church, when in the person of Pope Adrian she humbly, and almost on her knees, implored Erasmus for help against Luther; and the lukewarm indifferentist refused it with the remark, 'I told 'you what was coming.'

The schism fairly consummated, Luther had now to be the champion and conductor of a declared reformation; to wage war with the Roman Church, and to construct, superintend, and provide for the wants of his own.

The war with Rome was the more easy department to him of the two. The necessity of self-restraint over, and the policy which had hitherto demanded more or less of disguise, now positively directing the most full and broad exposure of the Papacy; such an exposure as would soil and defile the prestige of ages, and accustom men to despise and trample on what they had hitherto reverenced; he had only to give full swing to his feeling, and let himself be carried away by the force of an at once deliberate and wild impetuosity. The controversial turn of Luther is known. It must be allowed even by his admirers that he flooded the earth with his abuse. As a controversialist, he was literally and wholly without decorum, conscience, taste, or fear. He did not know what it was to hesitate, to waver, upon an epithet or a gibe. There is no appearance in his style of his ever having once in the whole of his controversial career said to himself—Shall I say this or not? He said whatever he liked. He consulted strength alone. If that was to be bought, he refused no price. He was unscrupulously gross and foul-mouthed in his more solid vituperation: in his lighter banter, there was that extremity of insolence which we notice in the derision of a sharp and low crowd at a hustings, choosing exactly, in their battery upon an obnoxious candidate, the terms and the style the most offensive to his self-respect. A royal and majestic dignitary (Henry VIII. of England) engages in theological controversy with Luther, and is thus answered:—'The Lord 'Henry, not by the grace of God, King of England, has written 'in Latin against my treatise. There are some who believe that 'this pamphlet of the king's did not emanate from the king's own 'pen; but whether Henry wrote, or Hal, or the devil in hell, 'is nothing to the point. He who lies is a liar. My own 'notion about the matter is, that Henry gave out an ell or two 'of coarse cloth, and that then this pituitous Thomist, Lee, the 'follower of the Thomist herd, who in his presumption wrote 'against Erasmus, took scissors and made a cope of it. If a 'king of England spits his impudent lies in my face, I have 'a right in my turn to throw them back down his own throat. 'If he blasphemes my sacred doctrines, if he casts his filth at the 'throne of my Monarch, my Christ, he need not be astonished 'at my defiling in like manner his royal diadem, and proclaiming him, King of England though he be, a liar and a rascal. . . . 'He thought to himself, Luther is so hunted about, he will have 'no opportunity of replying to me; I need not fear to throw 'any thing that comes first to hand in the poor monk's path. 'Ah! ah! my worthy Henry! you've reckoned without your 'host in this matter: you've had your say, and I'll have mine. 'You shall have truths that won't amuse you at all. I'll make 'you smart for your tricks. This excellent Henry accuses me 'of having written against the Pope out of personal hatred and 'ill-will; of being snarlish and quarrelsome, backbiting, proud, 'and so conceited, that I think myself the only man of sense in 'the world! I ask you, worthy Hal, what has my being conceited, snappish, and cross-grained, supposing I am so, to do 'with the question? Is the Papacy free from blame, because I 'am open to it? Is the King of England a wise man because 'I suppose him to be a fool? Answer me that. . . . What most 'surprises me is not the ignorance of this Hal of England, not that 'he understands less about faith and works than a log of wood, 'but that the devil should trouble himself to make use of this 'man against me. King Henry justifies the proverb, "Kings 'and princes are fools." I shall say very little more about him at 'present, for I have the Bible to translate, and other important 'matters to attend to: on some future occasion, God willing, 'when I shall be more at leisure, I will reply at greater length 'to this royal driveller of lies and poison. . . . I imagine that he 'set about his book by way of penance, for his conscience is 'ever smiting him for having stolen the crown of England, 'having made way for himself by murdering the last scion of 'the royal line. . . . Hal and the Pope have exactly the same 'legitimacy: the Pope stole his tiara, as the king his crown, and 'therefore it is that they are as thick together as two mules in 'harness.' The rage of the great monarch on being addressed with such unbounded freedom is evidently before the writer's mind here, and acts as his amusement and his stimulus. It is not difficult to see that the writer of such a passage as this was capable of higher flights in the same department,—of stronger, deeper, more passionate, virulent abuse, when it was his humour. 'Come on, pigs that you are, burn me if you dare! I am here to 'be seized upon,' he addresses the Thomists. 'My ashes shall 'pursue you after my death, though you throw them to all the 'winds, into all the seas. Pigs of Thomists! do what you can. 'Luther will be the bear in your path, the lion in your way. 'He will pursue you wherever you go, he will present himself 'incessantly before you, will leave you not a moment's peace or 'truce, till he has broken your iron head and your brazen front.' Luther always exerted the powers of a Comus towards his adversaries.

> 'Their human countenance,
> The express resemblance of the gods, is changed
> Into some brutish form of wolf or bear,
> Or ounce, or tiger, hog, or bearded goat.'

A series of caricatures exhibited the Pope and his adherents under complex forms of brutishness, in which ass, calf, hog, ox, elephant, griffin, and fish all mingled. The 'Pope-ass and the Monk-calf,' and 'the Papal Sow,' were accompanied with explanations, that no part of the uncomplimentary symbolism might be lost. Nor, while Luther searched earth, air, sea, and sky for epithets, did he despise the commonest; he had even a prevailing bias to them as being the strongest—to one especially above all others—one invested, by universal consent, with a kind of technical and legal precedence. Luther is unsparing in decking his opponents with long ears; 'They've got their ears too 'long by half, with their hihau! hihau!'—(some critics had reflected on his Bible translation). 'Tell them that Dr. Martin 'Luther abides by his translation, regarding a Papist and a 'jackass as one and the same thing.'

But his mere sallies, after all, do not give the true idea of Luther as a vituperator; it is the constant mingling of the vituperative with the subject, whatever it be, in hand—its incorporation with his style—its unwearied and incessant flow, which astonishes; the rush is sometimes stronger, sometimes weaker; but the floodgates are always open, and invectives ever issuing from Luther's mouth. He is perfectly conscious of his own warmth, and, like a true clever man, has a *rationale* for it. 'I 'was born,' he says, 'to meet parties and demons hand to hand 'on the field of battle; therefore my writings are full of war 'and tempest. I am the rough pioneer who has to prepare the 'ways and level the road. But the master of arts, Philip '(Melancthon) advances calmly and gently; he cultivates and he 'plants; he sows and he waters joyfully according to the gifts 'which God has made him.' As he proceeds through the Epistle to the Galatians, he sees a strong resemblance in himself to S. Paul. The Apostle occasionally uses language of strong rebuke: '*Est et nostra castigatio dura et stylus vehemens,*' adds Luther. The Apostle says, 'I would they were cut off that 'trouble you.' '*Atrocia verba, horribilia fulmina,*' remarks Luther: '*Paulus acerbissime perstringit, acerbe invehitur:*' 'I, too, 'Martin Luther, *contra Papam volo et debeo sanctâ superbiâ superbire.*' He forgot that, in the first place, S. Paul uses very different language from that of Martin Luther; and in the second, that he uses that language much less frequently than Martin Luther does his. The comparison overlooks entirely what is an important feature in the case, the question of quantity. S. Paul does not anathematize false prophets in every verse of his Epistles; and an epithet of rebuke once in an Epistle, is not a precedent for an epithet of abuse many times over in a page.

The truth is—though such an explanation is no excuse—faults of temper are the natural faults accompanying strong powers of action. Luther could not have done what he did, if he had not been constitutionally endowed with powers of action in the most wonderful degree: and to possess these powers was to possess a never-failing stimulus to temper. Action of all kinds is connected with, and depends more or less on, the element of passion in the human mind. That necessary state of desire in the mind which all action supposes, in order to account for itself and explain its own origin, is of the nature of passion: and therefore in literal truth no human being can act at all without some passion in him to make him: he cannot walk or talk, move hand or arm, bend joint or sinew without it; he cannot open the door or shut it, or step from one corner of the room to the other but by means of this element in his nature: and passion is the electric or magnetic power which sets every thing within him in motion, and makes him the acting creature he is. Thus the charms of active bodily exercises, and feats of strength: they satisfy a certain passion of action, as we may call it in our nature, and give it play and vent: the process of climbing, leaping, running up-hill, gives a certain impetus and eagerness in the mind, which would otherwise be in painful restlessness in consequence of inaction, its proper action and *quietus*. And on this principle, we see the commonest kind of action accompanied with passionate excesses, or what we call temper. Thus few people will remove any obstacle to their motion,—a chair, or stool, or table, with exactly the degree of strength which is, and which they themselves know to be, sufficient to remove it. Some will instantaneously inflict the most extravagant superfluity of removal on the offending obstacle; and most persons will remove it more forcibly and farther off than is necessary: not that it is of the smallest advantage to do so, but simply because the material comes into collision with their powers of action; and those powers are fundamentally connected with a species of irascibility. And though such general passion as lies at the bottom of all human action hardly deserves the name, and is an animal rather than a distinctly human impulse—the blind substratum rather than the thing itself—its quality rises with the quality of the action with which it is connected, till it becomes true human passion. Such passion, as connected with power of action, appears remarkably in the characters of the world's great men. It comes out, indeed, often in their case in forms so frightful and extreme that we cease to connect it with such general powers, and regard it as a distinct disease; but it plainly is connected with these powers, and we see that, but for that natural strength of passion of which these horrible excesses were the corruptions and embrutements, these men never could have been the great men they were. The Sylla who decimated Athens because an Athenian wit had passed a joke on his physiognomy, and who on his death-bed saw Granius strangled before his eyes, was the Sylla of the Mithridatic and Social Wars, and the reformer of the Republic. He wrote his own epitaph correctly—'Here lies Sylla, who was 'never outdone in kindness by a friend, or revenge by an 'enemy:' that is to say, here lies a man of intense passions. Who cannot see a connexion between the future Napoleon and the boy who vomited with rage on hearing a reflection passed upon his native Corsica? The strong powers of command and arrangement which such men must have, to be what they are, and bend minds and circumstances as they do, require passion to sustain them, as a tree requires sap. Even our thinking powers require this support, in a way; and the most purely intellectual processes, as soon as ever they become deep and difficult, cannot be carried on without a force of will, which latent passion supplies. All things within and without seem to be ever trying to throw off the empire of mind over them: events get out of control, ideas get out of control; affairs will put themselves, as if from sheer malice, in the most inconvenient and awkward posture, every thing happening when it ought not, and clashing with every thing else; thoughts fly off, disperse, and refuse to be brought to any head; and the mind has to bring all into order by means of a certain natural force of will or passion.

> 'Luctantes ventos tempestatesque sonoras
> Imperio premit.'

Even passion itself must be subdued by passion; and feelings, as they swell into excess, be put down by a forcible antagonist will, which comes from the heart and is in a sense passionate. All strong energetic action having such an internal accompaniment, the consequence is what was to be expected, viz., that from the lowest up to the highest examples of energy, from the energetic man who fells timber or mows grass to the energetic man who rules a nation, as sure as we hear of energy, almost as surely we hear of temper. Industrious and cross, idle and good-tempered, is the housekeeper's experience of servants. Raise the dignity of the epithets, and the same experience applies to higher agents in the world's system. The energetic statesman, ecclesiastic, artist, merchant, poet, is exceedingly apt to be a man of temper. The wide prevalence of the combination is of course no excuse for it; for it only shows that the passionate element in the human constitution tends to excess, and that where there is a strong temptation in a particular direction, the majority will yield to it. Christian principle suggests, that where energy really interferes with Christian temper, the former should give way to the latter. It is of more importance to a man that his temper should be Christian, than that he should govern a party, a nation, a church, or a world. And if he finds himself embarked on a line which necessarily demands a too great amount of energy for him,—if the multitude of his occupations, and the despatch with which he has to go through them, and the interruptions which harass, and the intensity of thought and action which excites him, are too severe a trial to his gentleness and patience, and the result is that he becomes proud and overbearing; a charitable judge will make the proper allowance; but it must still be remembered, that he is responsible for the issue of his situation upon himself; more especially since, in nine cases out of ten, he put himself into it.

Luther had enormous activities, and had that strong passion which goes along with them: and he was lifted by himself, in connexion with events, into a position which demanded the constant support which the whole strength of his nature could give. He had a whole cause to push, maintain, and support,—a whole world to oppose. His strength carried him through his work, and he gave it in reward all the indulgence which it could possibly demand. The war in which he was engaged was controversial,—a war in which words and not swords carried the day. The strength of his nature, consequently, was developed in the shape of words. His fertility and ready wit gave him peculiar command over this field. Nature gives horns to bulls, and hoofs to horses; to Luther she gave a tongue. The word always came immediately as it was wanted, and impetus suffering no check went on till strength had become coarseness, and coarseness indecency. Such a passionate temperament, with such a ready weapon, hit everybody that came within reach. There was quite enough for Luther in the simple fact that a man was a theological antagonist, to provoke a strong epithet. The disgust which high-mindedness feels instantaneously toward anything which stands in its way, as if nothing visible or invisible, human or divine, had any right to oppose it, inflicted its contumely by instinct almost before it was aware of its own act:—'Why do you oppose me?—take that!' Frederic of Prussia carried a cane, with which he vented a perpetual supply of abstract and causeless indignation upon the backs of his officers. Luther, in addition to a temperament, had also a motive; he was the leader of a cause. The storm of nature drove on with the directness of intention, and knocked down every obstacle in the one line of its own motion.

The internal conduct and direction of his own movement was a more difficult and anxious task. It is easier to pull down than to build up in religion; to attack than to construct and maintain. Luther had a completely new ground, both doctrinal and ecclesiastical, to make; he had a new doctrine, the Lutheran dogma of justification by faith, to propagate and transmit to posterity; he had a new society to form, which was to be the keeper and transmitter of it. It was absolutely necessary to construct a whole new system, internal and external, doctrinal and corporate—that is to say, a new Church.

To enable himself to construct a new Church, a theory in the first instance was necessary, and a new theory. And, accordingly, a formal theory is laid in Luther's works for this purpose—the theory now so familiar to us, viz. that every baptized person is a priest. As a priesthood makes sacraments, and sacraments make a Church, this theory at once supplied Luther with the power of making a Church. Baptism was all he wanted; and baptism he had. Every baptized person could, as far as principle went, administer the sacraments, and perform all the offices of a priest. What members of the baptized body should perform such offices was, indeed, a grave question of external order; and the founder of a Church was obliged to secure order. He could only secure order by authority, and therefore he had to fix upon some authority. But the only authority he wanted was one for this external purpose; and such an authority seemed ready made for him in the State. He made the State this authority, and the whole question was settled. This theory, however, seldom makes its appearance in formal shape in Luther's works, and is more commonly implied than expressed. It was practically the only kind of Church he could found, if he was to found one at all. The question was settled for him by circumstances, and he let circumstances settle it for him: he had kings on his side, and he had no bishops. The great doctrine he had to promulgate, in short, created its own Church, and sanctioned its own priesthood and sacraments. If it was true, there must be some way of preserving and transmitting it; and that way could be only the establishment of a Church. A society is the natural keeper of an idea, and Luther, full of the truth of his own idea of justification, of which he considered himself the all but inspired teacher, made a society in what way he could. The established channels of Ordination, the Episcopacy, the Apostolical Succession, a whole system of external Church appointments, which was coeval with Christianity, went for nothing, in comparison with the necessities of a new doctrine demanding some mode of establishing and transmitting itself. If Luther had had an Episcopacy ready to hand, and ready to go along with him, he would not have rejected it; but as he had not got it, he did without it. The new Lutheran Church rose up because the Lutheran doctrine wanted it, and appealed to no other sanction or right.

But Luther, in establishing his new society, with its form of worship, prayers, ceremonial, and whole external system, proceeded with that caution and accommodating spirit which have been already noticed in him. His great maxim was, that the doctrine would create its own proper worship and its own externals. He therefore gave himself no trouble to put down the actual ceremonial forms themselves which were established, and used no violence. Preach my doctrine, he said; that will do more than any direct attack upon such things can do; that must and will undermine all the established ceremonial and external system, if it only continues to be preached; that is worth all the force and battery in the world. Thus the mass went on, the same vestments continued to be used, the images still stood, and the whole interior of the church fabric remained as before. 'You ask me for a form 'of celebrating mass,' he writes to Spalatin. 'I entreat you to 'trouble me no more about these minutiæ; let the conscience 'be kept quite free on the subject. It is by no means a thing 'of such importance as that, on its account, we should chain 'down the spirit of liberty with additional rules, regulations, and 'traditions. We have enough of them and to spare.' Later, *i.e.* in 1526, he writes, 'The mass is celebrated with the accus-'tomed rites and in the same costume as formerly, the only diffe-'rence is that we sing some hymns in German, and that the 'words of consecration are in German. Indeed, I should not have 'abolished the Latin mass at all, or have substituted the verna-'cular, had I not found myself compelled to do so.' 'If you 'have not already abolished the Latin mass,' he writes to a minister, 'do not abolish it, but merely introduce into it a few German 'hymns. If it be abolished, at all events retain the old order and 'costumes.' The adoration of saints he would not forbid: 'Let 'each follow his own interpretation of such matters. Truth and 'charity forbid men to dispute and also arbitrarily condemn 'one another, for faith and charity hate sects and schisms. I 'would resolve the question of the adoration of God in the saints 'by saying that it is a thing entirely free and indifferent.' On the subject of relics he would only say, 'I believe the whole 'collection of them has been already quite enough exhibited.' Purgatory, he thought, 'was very uncertain.' Confession was 'a good thing.' There was no harm in keeping festivals or going pilgrimages. 'Ceremonies are not necessary to salvation,' he said, 'yet they produce an effect upon rude and uncultivated minds.' 'I condemn no ceremony which is not contrary to the Gospel.' 'You are about to organize the church at Kœnisberg,' he writes to a pastor, 'I entreat you, in the name of Christ, to make as few 'changes as possible. You have in your neighbourhood several 'Episcopal towns, and it is not desirable that the ceremonies of 'our new Church should vary in any marked degree from the old 'ritual.' Even with respect to monasteries and nunneries, for which he had such deep aversion, he took and countenanced no violent steps. Only voluntary desertion was encouraged, and not that in all cases. 'I would not advise persons advanced in 'age to quit the cloister, because returning helpless to the world 'they would necessarily become a charge to other people, and 'would scarcely meet in these uncharitable days with the care 'and attention to which their age is entitled. In the interior of 'the monastery they are a burden to no one; and, moreover, they 'are in a position to do a great deal in aid of the spiritual salva-'tion of their neighbours, which, were they in the world, it 'would be difficult, nay, I will almost say, impossible for them 'to do.' Of another case, 'We should leave poor nuns like these 'to live on after their own fashion.' Such was the cautious and dilatory line on which Luther had determined, and to which, notwithstanding the perpetual siege upon it, he adhered. Letters from pastors in all directions, indeed, pressed for immediate decisions on different points of faith and practice; and innumerable tender consciences revolted from this and that part of the established system of worship and ceremonial; of which each wanted an answer from him instantaneous, absolute, and on its own side. One and another pastor was for immediately abolishing either confession, or saint-worship, or images, or the reception of the sacrament in one kind, or pilgrimages, or festivals and fasts. But Luther maintained his qualified position, and adhered obstinately to ambiguities and negatives. He parried the questions; soothed and calmed the questioners; advised quietness and delay, and ended with reiterating the favourite dictum, that all would be certain to come right if *the doctrine* was preached. The magnanimous ease and repose of the great leader of the movement stands out strikingly amid the petty scruples and small activities of the inferior agents; and Luther submits to all these questionings with that half-kind, half-scornful condescension with which dignified persons submit to any bore which their position brings upon them. 'The whole world pestered him,' he said, 'with questions;' but as people would not be satisfied if they had not answers of some kind, he sent them answers: an amiable weakness deserved some indulgence. As for himself, he wanted to put down nothing which his doctrine would allow to stand; and he would let the doctrine find out what could stand with it and what could not. He had no desire to interfere himself in the matter. An easy capacious liberalism objected to the dogmatic enforcement of fasts and feasts, vestments, images, and the like, but so long as they were left voluntary, saw no harm in them. Dogmatism in rejecting, and dogmatism in enforcing, were both condemned; and the spirit of Luther's reformation was in some aspects a remarkable anticipation of that modern Germanism, which is associated amongst ourselves with the name of Dr. Arnold.

But Luther was compelled, like many other teachers, to see a favourite line of policy broken in upon; and, however moderate and procrastinating his own views might be, a crowd of troublesome followers were not to be wholly coerced. He had the pain of seeing, one after another, various tendencies in the Reformation prematurely brought out and exhibited in exaggerated shape, and with accompaniments of violence and horror, before the world. Carlstadt and the image-breakers of Wittemberg, Munzer and the fanatic revolutionist peasants of Thuringia, John of Leyden and the Anabaptists, diverted the Reformation from its regular and orderly course, and disgraced it by monstrous associations.

Luther was in the benevolent confinement of the castle of Wartburg, where his friend the Elector Frederick had placed him after the Diet of Worms, when he heard of the iconoclast excesses of Carlstadt and his party at Wittemberg. In addition to the evil itself of such excesses, the fact that a vain, shallow, noisy man should be taking advantage of his absence to assume a lead, and gratify his own envy for his superior—for that motive was deep in Carlstadt's mind—provoked and roused him. He first wrote letters to the Wittembergers:—'You have rushed into your present proceedings, eyes shut, 'head down like a bull. Reckon no longer on me; I cast you 'off; I abjure you. You began without me; finish how you may.' His letters producing no effect, he determined to see what his personal presence would do. The monastic gown laid aside, and the steel cuirass, long heavy sword, plumed casque, and spurs and boots of a man at arms assumed, he escaped from Wartburg, and suddenly, amidst a crowd of valets and a cloud of dust, as Lucas Cranach has painted him, made his appearance in the streets of Wittemberg. His next step was to enter the church, (which, strewed with the fragmentary blocks of the old statuary, like a mason's shop, gave ocular witness to the late excesses,) and ascend the pulpit. The Wittembergers now *en masse* before him, he scolded them like boys:—'Satan,' he commenced, 'has been busy in my absence, and sent you some 'of his prophets. He knows whom to send; but you ought to 'know, too, that I am the only person you should listen to. 'Martin Luther is the first man of the Reformation: others 'come after him; he, therefore, should command, and you 'should obey. It is your lot. I am the man to whom God 'has revealed His word. I know Satan, and am not afraid of 'him; I have hit him a blow which he will feel a long time.' Carlstadt was in church during this discourse, but hid himself behind a pillar to avoid Luther's eye. He and his fellow-prophets, Munzer, Stubner, and others, made their retreat, and left Luther in possession of the field.

In another quarter, the Peasant Sedition gave Luther much annoyance. The peasant population of Thuringia, of the Palatinate, of the Dioceses of Mayence, Halberstadt, and Odenwald, had long murmured under the weight of their servitude, and the various exactions and oppressions, petty and great, of the nobles. They took advantage now of the reforming movement to rise in arms and assert their rights. Under the leadership of Goetz, '*with the Iron Hand*,' and George Metzler, they assembled in the Black Forest, got possession of Mergentheim, and compelled several counts, barons, and knights to join them. The subjects of the powerful Count of Hohenlohe were soon added; the Count himself being compelled to sign a treaty with the insurgents for a hundred years. The town of Landau, and the environs of

Heibroam rose. The body got reinforcements daily, and town after town opened their gates to them. Agents from the main army dispersed through the several districts, received oaths of adhesion, and imposed tribute—the clergy of Mayence paying in a fortnight fifteen thousand gold florins. A mixture of religious and political fanaticism formed the basis of this revolutionary movement. The insurgents marched under the banner of a white cross, and to the music of the Marseillaise hymns of the day. As soon as their body was compacted, and scheme formed, a public statement, divided into the well-known Twelve Articles, set forth their grievances and their rights. They demanded the free election of their pastors, relief from various feudal exactions, and, last of all, release from slavery and villanage; and they appealed to Luther to sanction and support their claims. Luther answered their appeal, and undertook the task of mediation. He published an 'Exhortation to Peace,' in which he divided himself nearly equally between the two contending sides. He rebuked the nobles for their rapacity and oppression, and the peasants for their insubordination and licence. To the former he said: 'It is quite clear that you 'have no one upon earth to thank for all this disorder but you 'yourselves, princes and lords;—it is you and your crimes 'God is about to punish. If the peasants who are now attack'ing you are not the ministers of His will, others coming after 'them will be so. You may beat them, but you will be none the 'less vanquished; you may crush them to the earth, but God 'will raise up others in their place: it is His pleasure to 'strike you, and He will strike you.' To the latter he said: 'Authority is unjust, but you are more in the wrong even 'than authority; you who, not content with interdicting the 'Word of God, trample it under foot, and arrogate to your'selves the power reserved to God alone.' And he repelled, by Scripture arguments, their claim to release from villanage: 'You wish to apply to the flesh the Christian liberty taught by 'the Gospel, but I would ask you, did not Abraham and the 'other patriarchs, as well as the prophets, keep bondmen? S. 'Paul himself tells us, that the empire of this world cannot 'subsist without an inequality of persons.'

Thus far the position of the insurgents was a respectable one, and Luther gave them a modified support. But a body of insurgent peasants could not keep up its respectability long. It fell soon into the fanatical leadership of Munzer, and plunged into frightful atrocities. Under the watchword of 'No quarter to idle men,' they massacred all the nobles who fell into their hands; in Franconia alone they pillaged and burned two hundred and ninety-three monasteries; and their revolutionary theory, grown monstrous, demanded the universal levelling of social ranks. Luther saw immediately that he could not afford to mix up his cause with such a cause as theirs now was, and he threw them off with characteristic decision. 'Miserable 'spirits of confusion! no mercy, no toleration is due to the 'peasants; on them should fall the wrath of God and of man; 'the peasants are under the ban of God and of the Emperor, 'and may be treated as mad dogs.' In the event, the peasants were massacred wholesale, Luther actually hounding on the nobles to the work.

It is not surprising that Luther's conduct in this matter should have encountered criticism, and that the observation should be made, that he favoured the peasants at first and bitterly denounced them afterwards. While we see in his conduct here, however, the natural vehemence of his character, and unscrupulous summariness of his policy, we cannot, with M. Audin, accuse him of inconsistency. His favour to the peasants at first was favour coupled with advice. If they neglected his advice, the favour was not obliged to last. He told them to be moderate, and meet their masters half way: they took to massacring and levelling. As soon as he saw this, he had done with them. Had they put themselves under his guidance, he would have made use of them, and stood up for them. But as they chose to be their own masters, and behave senselessly, he said: Miscreants, you are injuring my cause, and I will rid myself of you as soon as possible. And, as Luther never did any thing by halves, his form of throwing them off was, calling for their massacre. For this form he is responsible, but we see no inconsistency in the line of conduct. M. Audin regards Luther as a sympathizer with political fanaticism in the first instance, and, when he saw the results, then turning round upon the actors whom his sympathies had encouraged. But this was not the case. Luther never had any sympathy with levellers; he gave no encouragement to the peasants to become political fanatics. He had strong sympathies with regular monarchical and aristocratic power; and from the first he strongly advised the peasants, while they claimed freedom from particular oppressions and exactions, to submit quietly to remain in their established servile state. M. Audin makes two separate addresses of Luther's to the peasants, of which the popularly-toned one he dates before, the aristocratically-toned one after, the excesses of the peasant war; and hence accuses Luther of changing sides with events; but these two were not separate addresses, but only two parts of one and the same address, qualifying and balancing each other.

But Luther's bitterest vexations were the doctrinal developments which the Reformation now began to show in some quarters. A hard sceptical materialist spirit, not content with the freedom from the law of works which he had achieved, began to empty and dry up the channels of grace. The Anabaptists under Carlstadt, and still more fanatical prophets than he, attacked the sacrament of Baptism; the Swiss under Zwinglius, the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The former denied infant-baptism,—a denial involving a rationalistic theory of that sacrament, and converting it into an imposing rite for impressing the mature intellect. The latter directly rationalized away the mystery of the Eucharist, converting it into a simple memorial and symbol. Luther denounced these manifestations, and whenever he could persecuted the movers. Carlstadt, already driven from Wittemberg, was soon again driven from Orlamund, whither he had retired next; and then soon driven from Jena, whither he had retired next. Luther drove him from place to place, and, apparently forgetting that the unfortunate man, if he lived at all, must live somewhere, barricaded one town against his entrance just as he fastened the gates of another upon his departure. The issues of the prolific presses of Jena were stopped at the shop-door by the Elector's officers: 'It was not to be endured,' said Luther, 'that Carlstadt and his people should be alone permitted to 'emancipate themselves from due submission to authorities.' The author attempted to fix at Schweindorf, but Count Henneberg instructed the town council not to admit him for an hour. He was at last allowed the tether of two little villages near Wittemberg, where he and his wife lived by manual labour, one digging, and the other crying cakes. One attempt to reassume the black gown then banished him from Saxony altogether, and he took refuge in Switzerland. '*Fanatici spiritus*'—'Celestial prophets,' were Luther's terms for all this tribe of theologians: whatever the particular subject in hand may be, at every turn in his controversial writings and commentaries, the 'fanatic spirits' get a rebuke. Disdain of the men never subdued his sense of their mischievousness; and irony mixed with irritation in all his allusions to them. Seldom condescending to argue, he asked them at once for the miracles by which they proved their new revelation, and not having this demand answered, dismissed them. In the well-known interview at which the two theologians defied each other, Carlstadt, always aping Luther, cannot meet the swing of Luther's careless contempt: *he* threatens, and Luther laughs. 'I will write against you,' says the former. 'Write away,' says the latter, 'here is a florin for you, if you do it well.' Luther's disputation with the corporation of Orlamund is in the same style. The burgomaster, accompanied by the magistrates, received Luther at the gate with compliments; Luther barely saluted them with an inclination of the head. The burgomaster commenced an address, and Luther told him he had no time to hear him. They proceeded to the hall of conference, where all the people of the town were assembled in a state of the utmost excitement. A man out of the crowd began to shout. 'A 'prophet,' says Luther, 'by his voice; I know them all; your 'eyes, my friend, are like two hot coals, but they will not burn 'me.' The first of the proposed arguments, of which the subject was the lawfulness of images, then began, which ended thus: a cobbler of Orlamund *loquitur*:—'The text of Deuteronomy is 'clear; "Lest ye corrupt yourselves, and make you a graven 'image, the similitude of any figure, the likeness of male or 'female—" Luther, 'Go on.' "And lest thou lift up thine 'eyes unto heaven, and when thou seest the sun, and the moon, 'and the stars, should be drawn to worship them." Luther, 'So, 'then, you would take the sun and the moon out of the cre'ation?' Cobbler, 'The sun and moon were not made by us.' Luther, 'Well, then, you condemn me, do you?' Cobbler, 'Certainly: you, and all who do not preach God's word.' Luther, mounting his carriage, 'Farewell, then.' All the corporation—'What! not one word with you on the Sacraments?' Luther, 'Read my books.'

But the rising rationalistic view of the Lord's Supper was Luther's great trouble, as he surveyed the working of the Reformation; and Zwinglius was the great thorn in his side. In him he saw an undeniably able rival; stern, strong, and hard as a flint; who threatened to wrench the Reformation out of his grasp, carry it in another direction from that in which it had started, and infuse a different spirit into it to that which its original author had given.

The strong faith and reverence which Luther always professed with respect to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the pertinacity with which he clung to the idea of mystery and grace in connexion with it, the awe in which he stood of the inspired words of institution, and constant vindication of their obvious and full meaning for them, form a remarkable, and at first sight not very intelligible contrast with his perfectly free-and-easy treatment of Scripture when he comes across it on another great subject. On the subject of the Lord's Supper the sacred text chained and overpowered him: he professed that he could not get over the words, 'This is My body,' 'This is My blood,' and dare not trifle with them. They confronted him on the page of Scripture, and he submitted to them. He said he had tried to get over them, but found he could not; that they had stood in his way, and that he would have been too glad to have explained them away, if he had not on approaching them, found them too strong for him; that the tempter had especially assailed him on this point, and had not moved him. 'I confess,' he says, 'that if any had shown me 'five years ago, that, in the holy sacrament there is nothing 'but bread and wine, he would have rendered me a great 'service. I had at that time powerful temptations assailing 'me; I turned and twisted about; I struggled fiercely with 'my own thoughts; I should have been most joyful to have 'extricated myself from the doubts and difficulties which sur'rounded me. I saw well, that if I could have made up my 'mind on that point, I should inflict a most terrible blow 'on Papism. But, upon this matter, I am chained up in a 'prison I cannot quit: the text is too powerful; nothing I have 'ever heard has lessened its effects upon my mind.' Such was Luther's scrupulousness with respect to the text of Scripture on this subject, his adherence to obvious signification, and dislike of explanation. But it was very different when he had to support his doctrine of justification by faith and the non-necessity of works. There was no liberty then which he was not ready to take with the sacred text. He found the New Testament in every page appealing to a law which he declared the New Testament had abolished; and he explained Scripture away on as large and wholesale a scale as the extent of the obstacles demanded. He laid down a distinction between being *in* the Gospel, and being part of the Gospel. The Gospel had precepts in it which were not part of it, but only appendages to it. 'Quæ præcepta in Evangelio inveniuntur, ista non sunt Evange'lium, sed expositiones legis et appendices Evangelii.' The Gospel contained precepts just as it contained miracles, not as essential to its system, but only as an accidental accompaniment of its institution. 'Non est proprium Christi officium, propter quod 'præcipue venit in mundum, docere legem, sed accidentale. Cu'jusmodi erat et hoc quod sanabat infirmos, excitabat mortuos, 'benefaciebat indignos, consolabatur afflictos. Ea quidem gloriosa 'et divina opera et beneficia sunt, sed non propria Christi.'[1] Luther, like an expert chemist, thus analyzed the rude material of the Gospel, and discriminated between what was substantial in it, and what was not; what was genuine Gospel, and what was the old law, introduced, but not incorporated. When pushed another step in the argument, and asked to *account* for the introduction of the law, if it was *not* part of the system, he had a further explanation ready. There was, he confessed, a whole legal machinery in the Gospel; good works being commanded, and reward and punishment being made dependent on the performance; but this machinery was only a contrivance on the part of the Gospel to expose ultimately, with so much greater force, the emptiness of works. It was said, indeed, if you do the work, you will have the reward; but that 'if' was not a promissory, but a defying one: its meaning was, You will not do the work, and you will not deserve the reward; you will find that your labour is vain, and your work nothing. 'The what, and the 'how, of the reward,' says Luther, 'are not the question; the 'question is whether you can do the thing for which the 'reward is offered.' '*Homo præcepto impossibili monetur, ut videat 'suam impotentiam.*' In this way the whole system of law and precept which confronts us on the very surface of Scripture, was reduced, by a method of esoteric interpretation, into a mere husk and outside; the external fabric of the deeper truth that there was no law. The surface was for the natural man, the truth was for the believer. The Gospel language was only a pious fraud, and the issue showed the real meaning; just as when in some puzzle or piece of legerdemain the reality turns out to be the very contrary of the phenomenon.

---

[1] It will be observed that the argument here is not stated strongly enough for Luther's conclusion; for it is not enough for proving that precepts are not a substantial part of the Gospel, to say that they are not *propria*, i.e. the peculiar and exclusive characteristic of it. Nobody asserts that the law is the peculiar characteristic of the new dispensation; all that is maintained is, that the law goes on under it, as well as under the old one, and is not done away with. Luther's *non-propria*, then, must be strengthened into a stronger epithet, and be understood to mean not essential to, as well as not peculiar to it, if the argument is to be consistent.

Having up to a certain point contented himself with explaining away Scripture, Luther now advanced farther, and proceeded to disown Scripture. The Epistle of S. James, though opposing no insurmountable difficulties to the free interpreter, —as what language does?—was still a very difficult epistle to surmount: it was questionable whether the violence which would be necessary for its explanation would be greater than that of rejecting the epistle altogether; and Luther, hesitating a good deal between the two methods of dealing with it, inclines on the whole to the latter. He gives his view in his preface to the Epistles of S. James and S. Jude:[1]—

> '1. This Epistle of S. James, though it is rejected by the ancients, I praise and hold to be good, because it advances not any human doctrine, and urges strongly the law of God. But to give my own opinion of it, without prejudice to any other man's, I consider it to be the production of no apostle, and this is my judgment:
>
> '2. In the first place, because, directly contrary to St. Paul and to all the rest of the Scripture, it ascribes righteousness to works, and says: *Abra-*

---

[1] Luther's Works, ed. Walche, Halle, A.D. 1744, vol. xiv. p. 149; Preface to the Epistles of S. James and S. Jude.

ham was justified by his works, when he had offered his son; while S. Paul (Rom. iv. 2, 3) teaches, on the contrary, that Abraham without works was justified by his faith only, and proves from Moses (Gen. xv. 6,) that justification to have been before he had offered his son. Now, even though it were possible to bolster up this Epistle, and find some gloss for such justification by works, still it cannot be defended in this, that in ch. ii. 23, it quotes the aforesaid passage from Moses (Gen. xv. 6,) which speaks of Abraham's faith only, and not of his works, and is so quoted by S. Paul (Rom. iv. 3), as referring to works. Therefore this error is conclusive that it is the work of no apostle.

'3. In the second place, because, while he professes to be teaching Christian people, he never once thinks, in all the length of that his instruction, of the Passion, the Resurrection, or the Spirit of Christ. He names Christ, indeed, now and then; but he teaches not about him, but speaks only of a general faith in God. For the duty of a true apostle is to preach of the Passion, and Resurrection, and Office of Christ, and to lay the foundation of that same faith, as He Himself says, John xv. 27, *Ye shall bear witness of me.* And herein all the holy books that are truly such do agree, that they all with one accord preach and urge Christ. And this is the true touchstone wherewith to convict all books, the seeing whether they urge Christ or no, since all the Scripture points to Christ (Rom. iii. 21,) and S. Paul will *know nothing but Christ* (1 Cor. ii. 2). Whatsoever teaches not Christ, that is not apostolical, even though S. Peter or S. Paul taught it. On the other hand, whatever preaches Christ, that is apostolical, though it were Judas, Ananias, Pilate, and Herod's work.

'4. But this James does nothing more than insist on the law and its works, and rings the changes upon them to such excess, that it gives me the impression he must have been some good pious man, who had got hold of some sentences from the disciples of the apostles, and so put them on paper. Or it may have been perhaps written from his preaching by some one else. He calls (ch. i. 25) the law a *law of liberty*, while S. Paul, on the contrary, calls it a *law* of *bondage*, of *wrath*, of *death*, and of *sin*. (Gal. iii. 23, 24; Rom. vii. 11, 23.)

'5. Besides, he introduces texts from S. Peter (1 Pet. iv. 8), *Charity covereth a multitude of sins;* and (ch. v. 16), *Humble yourselves under the hand of God;* also (ch. iv. 5) a text from S. Paul (Gal. v. 17), *The spirit lusteth to envy.* Moreover, its spuriousness appears plainly from this, that while S. James in point of chronology was slain by Herod at Jerusalem before Peter, this author must have lived long after S. Peter and S. Paul.

'6. Upon the whole, he undertakes to put down all those who trusted to faith without works, and he is unequal to his task: he seeks to effect that by inculcation of the law which the apostles effect by incentives to love. For these reasons I cannot place him among the genuine canonical books; still neither do I gainsay any man to place and value this book as he may list: for otherwise there are in it many good sentences.'

This concluding paragraph runs in the edition of 1522 thus:—

'Upon the whole, he undertakes to put down those who trusted to faith only without works, and he is in spirit, understanding, and language, unequal to his task. He wrests Scripture, and, what is more, contradicts Paul and all the Scriptures, seeking to effect by inculcation of the law that which the apostles effect by incentives to love. For these reasons I will not have him in my Bible in the list of the true canonical books; still neither do I gainsay any man to place and value this book as he may list: for otherwise there are in it many good sentences. One man by himself is nobody in worldly matters; how, then, shall this writer, who is but one and alone, dare contradict Paul and all the other Scriptures?'[1]

The specimen of Luther's scrupulousness with respect to Scripture, and the specimen of his unscrupulousness now before us, suggest many obvious pieces of criticism: but we shall only

---

[1] The Preface which we have given is the Preface to the *particular Epistles* of S. James and S. Jude. This is a different and distinct preface from the Preface to the New Testament in general, which comes first of all. In this latter-mentioned Preface occurs the opprobrious epithet of the 'epistle of straw,' by which Luther designated the Epistle of S. James, and for which Archdeacon Hare gives the following apology: 'All sorts of persons complain that Luther called it *an* '*Epistle of straw;* and perhaps the loudest in this complaint are those to whom 'the whole Bible is little else than a book of straw. The expression, so far as I 'have been able to discover, occurs only in a part of the Preface to the German 'New Testament published in 1522, printed by Walch in vol. xiv. p. 105, and was 'omitted in the editions subsequent to 1524. Luther, in pointing out, for the 'instruction of those who were unused to the reading of the Bible, which books in 'the New Testament are of the greatest importance, says, as many have said 'before and since, that the Gospel of S. John is to be valued far above the other 'three, and concludes thus: "S. John's Gospel, and his first Epistle, the Epistles 'of S. Paul, especially those to the Romans, Galatians, Ephesians, and S. 'Peter's first Epistle,—these are the books which set Christ before you, and 'teach you every thing necessary and salutary for you to know, even though you 'were never to hear or see any other book or doctrine. Therefore the Epistle of 'S. James is quite an epistle of straw by the side of these; for it has no true 'evangelical character." Now, doubtless, if these books were to be severed from 'the rest of Scripture, it would be much as if you were to cut away the roots and 'trunk of a tree, and to fancy that the upper branches would still continue hanging in the air, putting forth leaves, and bearing fruit. On the other hand it 'should be observed that the expression applied to the Epistle of S. James is not 'used positively, but relatively, in comparison with those books of the New Testament in which the special doctrines of the Gospel are brought forward more fully 'and explicitly. It was probably suggested by what S. Paul says in 1 Cor. iii. 12; 'and, as I have often had occasion to remark, Luther's words are not to be weighed 'in a jeweller's scales. Besides we must take into account that, while he is quite 'right in denying the specially evangelical character of this Epistle, it had been 'turned by those who exaggerated and perverted its meaning, into the main prop 'of those very errors concerning faith and justification, which it was his peculiar 'mission to overthrow. Even in the quietest controversy we well know how difficult it is to measure all our thoughts and words, not to exaggerate what favours 'our own side, not to depreciate what supports our adversary. Who, then, will 'make a man an offender for a word, uttered in the stress of such a conflict, the 'most awful perhaps ever waged by man, inasmuch as it was not only against an 'external power which kept the hearts and minds of half Christendom in abject 'bondage, and answered an argument with a sentence of excommunication and an '*auto da fe*, but also in the first instance against the force of his own inveterate 'habits and prepossessions, nay, of a faith which he had himself long held earnestly 'and submissively before he detected its fallacy. Nor should it be forgotten that 'Luther omitted the offensive expression in the later editions of his New Testament.'—*Hare's Mission of the Comforter*, pp. 814—816.

Of this apology of Archdeacon Hare's we have nothing to say, except that it is perhaps as good a one as could be made. The truth is, no apology can be made for such language. Impetuosity and provocation cannot justify the contemptuous treatment of an inspired book of Scripture; nor should Archdeacon Hare suppose that by accounting for such an act, he goes any way to excuse it. Some or other impulse or motive accounts for every wrong act; but the act is not at all excused in consequence. We will add, that whatever may have become of the offensive epithet, 'epistle of straw,' in subsequent editions (and if Luther left it out, let the ask here, why was he so scrupulous in one case, so unscrupulous in another? Luther's modes of proceeding seldom require very nice criticism to explain. He was very scrupulous with respect to Scripture when it interposed against another man's dogma; very unscrupulous with respect to it when it interfered with his own. Justification without works was his own dogma; the Sacramentarian view of the Lord's Supper was Zwinglius's. Luther had his own great absorbing idea; he was prepared to push that out at all risk, and Scripture text and Scripture canon gave way before it. But he cared marvellously little about other men's new ideas, and thought it rather an impertinence that they should have them at all. He was then magisterial, and assumed the chair of the *doctor ecclesiæ*. He took the bold originator severely to task, confronted him with the Scripture

---

omission be taken into account,) the Preface which we have quoted appears in Walche's edition of Luther's works (1744,) without any sign whatever of abandonment by its author, or any intimation of its belonging only to a prior edition of Luther's works, as distinct from a later one. The Preface, therefore, we have given represents Luther's permanent opinions with respect to the Epistle of S. James.

Luther is generally defended from the sin of his attacks on the canon of Scripture on the ground that he modified his views afterward. But the modifications were comparatively slight, and never amounted to retractations. There were four Epistles of which he denied the inspiration: the Second Epistle of S. Peter, the Epistles of S. James and S. Jude, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, to which must be added the Book of Revelation. In the case of each of these, the reasons he assigns are sometimes very frivolous, and always simple opinions of his own upon the doctrine and style of the Epistle or Book he rejects. He sits in criticism upon Scripture; and if he thinks an Epistle evangelical, admits it; if not, rejects it. The text ch. x. ver. 26 of the Epistle to the Hebrews—'If we sin wilfully 'after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more 'sacrifice for sins'—offended him, and influenced him in his rejection of the Epistle. He also did not like to think that Esau 'found no place for repentance;' and that influenced him. The Revelation, again, was too full of visions in his opinion—it was 'through and through with figures:' he did not like this, and thought an apostle would not prophesy in such a way. Again, the writer of the Book of Revelations seemed to him to threaten too severely all those who 'shall add unto,' or 'shall take away from the words of the book:' 'whereas,' observes Luther, with easy levity, 'nobody knows what is in this book.' 'Let each man,' he says, 'judge of this book according to the light that is in him, and by his own 'particular perceptions. I do not desire to impose my opinion respecting it upon any 'one. I say simply that which I think of it myself. I look upon the Revelation 'of S. John to be neither apostolic nor prophetic.' Again of the same book, 'Many of the Fathers of the Church rejected this book; consequently every man is 'at liberty to treat it according to the dictates of his own mind. For my part, 'one single reason has determined me in the judgment I have come to respecting 'it, which is, that Christ is neither adored in it, nor taught in it such as we know 'Him.' In all these cases Walche is anxious to bring out all he can to prove that Luther changed his mind afterward; but he does not *profess* to show more than that his style is here and there subdued. Luther never altered the substance of his view, or *admitted* any of these regularly into the canon again; though, in the case of the Book of Revelations, he cancelled the whole of his old preface, and substituted a new one. He continued to reject all for himself, only saying that he did not wish to interfere with any other person's acceptance of them.

letter, protested against all liberties, was angry, scandalized, and shocked. It is but justice to add that Luther had, independently of this consideration, small sympathies with such a view as Zwinglius's. Luther hated formality in religion, but he had no objection to mystery. His whole view against works was antagonistic to form and rule, precision and positiveness in duties. But with mystery he had sympathies; his love of the supernatural in the region of common life, his ghost and fairy lore, the very grotesquenesses into which his supernaturalism ran, showed a mind possessed of the sense of mystery. The Swiss development of the Reformation, cold, hard, dry, and materialistic, repelled and disgusted him; he denounced its distinctive doctrine as a gratuitous and audacious innovation; and he proceeded to call Zwinglius names. 'What 'a fellow is this Zwinglius! ignorant, as a block, of grammar, 'and logic, and every other science.' 'Zwinglius I regard as 'having drawn upon himself the just hatred of all good men 'by his daring and criminal manner of treating the word of 'God.' With Zwinglius, Bucer went along. 'I know, too 'well, the wickedness of Bucer . . . . Christ guard thee, poor 'Luther, surrounded as thou art with these wild beasts, these 'vipers, lionesses, and panthers; far more in danger than was 'Daniel in the lions' den.'

There was another subject on which the Reformation began to show uncomfortable signs, and threaten dangerous developments: we allude to the subject of marriage. On this subject, indeed, Luther had himself established large premisses for license to appeal to.

Luther had a fundamental view with respect to marriage, conceived, as many other of his views were, in the spirit of one-sided and impatient contradiction to established ideas. That the abuses of the monastic system were great, and that force and tyranny in those ages drove numbers of both sexes into monasteries and convents, who were not at all fitted for the life, and who were deprived by such an incarceration of that development, moral and intellectual, of themselves which God had intended for them, nobody can fairly doubt. The story of the nun in the 'I Promessi Sposi' is only a specimen of what went on, on a large scale. There was a general wide-spread grievance; and it was a plain fact, that the Divine institution of marriage was unlawfully interfered with by human systems. To expose such a grievance, and obtain a remedy for it, was in itself a legitimate task for any one to undertake. But Luther undertook it in that extravagant and excessive spirit in which he undertook every other work. He opposed a practical grievance in one direction by an extreme theory in another, and set up a code which was new to the Christian world. He seems to have regarded himself as under a special prophetical commission to revive the original matrimonial charter given to the human race; and he set about his work with the spirit with which a political revolutionist goes back to his theory of the social compact. He overlooked the qualifications, cautions, and exceptions with which to us, under the Christian dispensation, this charter comes down accompanied; and that whole department of Christian precept, which, however much abused, was in itself a Divine modification, interpreting the original law to us, just as subsequent judgments interpret original statutes in civil courts, was entirely thrown over to make way for a naked reassertion of the original law itself. With his usual decision and point, Luther threw himself upon the original command in the 28th verse of the 1st chapter of Genesis: '*Crescite et multiplicamini.*' In this sentence he saw the whole of the Divine law, advice, and recommendation on the subject of marriage collected. Here, he said, is a universal command or statute, under the action of which the whole human race comes. It is quite evident, therefore, that everybody is intended to marry, and that everybody should marry. Nobody has a right to resist the law of God, and oppose himself to the original act of creation. To this universal law, indeed, Luther did admit nominally exceptions; he was obliged nominally to allow the force of the text in the 19th chapter of S. Matthew: but he loaded the text with such restrictions, and compelled everybody, who stood upon it, to give such demonstrable reasons that he was of the particular class which the text singled out; that practically his theory amounted to a universal and essential obligation. In accordance with this new speculative movement, society was, with respect to the general rules and regulations of marriage, thrown back upon the Old Testament code, as distinguished from the subsequent legislation of the New. The temper of a sterner and purer dispensation disregarded, the forbidden degrees were largely thrown open. Luther countenanced even more flagrant violations of the Christian code; and his Sermon *de Matrimonio*, delivered at Wittemberg in the year 1522, gives licences from which the natural conscience of a heathen and a savage would recoil. Without dwelling, however, on these special extravagances, it is sufficient to remark, that the whole of the matrimonial question was stirred up from its basis again, and that, an established system of Christian growth removed, the field was opened anew for the indefinite play of speculation and practice. There was an open area; a new code was invited, and the original statute, '*Crescite et multiplicamini*,' was the axiom appealed to.

That such a theoretical movement on the subject of marriage should produce some awkward practical fruits, was not surprising. So fierce and naked an appeal to original rights was likely to set men speculating very freely and largely as to what their rights were. It was not surprising if, amid the clearance of established ideas, a certain Elector Philip of Hesse began to imagine that there would be no great harm in having two wives. The appeal had been made to the old dispensation; and under the old dispensation a plurality of wives was allowed. Philip described his case as a very strong one, and supplicated earnestly.

Now it is obvious that as soon as a demand like this was, in an actual individual case, urged upon Luther, he had no solid ground on which to oppose it. Luther could not, upon his principles, say at once that it was wrong for a Christian to marry a second wife; nor *did* he ever. He was asked the question more than once, and always pointedly refused to say that such an act was absolutely wrong. Thus he writes to an inquirer: 'To your first question, whether a man 'may have more than one woman to wife, my answer is this. 'Unbelievers may do what they please; but Christian freedom 'is to be regulated according to love, so that every thing should 'be determined with a view to our neighbour's good, where no 'necessity or sin against faith or conscience prevents us. Now 'however every one seeks that freedom, which will serve and 'profit himself, without regard to his neighbour's benefit or 'edification; although S. Paul says, "All things are lawful to 'me, but all things are not expedient: Only use not your 'liberty for an occasion to the flesh."—Again, though the 'ancients had many wives, Christians are not to act after such 'an example, because there is no necessity, nor edification, nor 'special word of God, commanding this; and such great scandal 'and trouble might come from it. Therefore do not esteem the 'Christian as more free, unless there be some command of God 'with regard to such freedom.' In this answer he discourages the liberty of taking more than one wife, as fraught with scandal, and not serving to edification: he advises persons to do with one wife, but he cannot absolutely command them. As the Elector said: 'Lutherus scribit, *se bigamiam non suadere*.' He dissuades as a counsellor and friend, he cannot and wishes not to do more. On the demand of the Landgrave then reaching them, this was the line which Luther's and Melancthon's answer adopted. They dissuaded him from the contemplated step, and told him of the scandal which would arise from it if known; but admitted at the same time that if he insisted upon it, they could not forbid it. The letter, which bears the names of Luther, Melanchthon, Bucer, Melander, Corvinus, Adam, Leningus, Winteferte, from beginning to end alternates from one to the other of these two points, and finally grants the permission required.[1]

---

[1] 'With regard to the question, of which Master Bucer spoke with us, firstly, this is our opinion. Your grace knows and understands this yourself, that it is a very different thing to make a general law, and in a particular case to use a dispensation, out of weighty reasons, and yet according to Divine permission; for against God no dispensation has force. Now we cannot advise that it be openly introduced, and thus made a law, that each be allowed to have more than one wife. But should any thing of this get into print, your grace may conceive that this would be understood and adopted as a general law, whence much scandal and trouble would ensue. Therefore this is by no means to be adopted; and we pray your grace to consider how grievous it would be, if it were charged upon any one that he had introduced this law in the German nation, whence endless trouble in all marriages might be feared. As to what may be said against this, that what is right before God should be altogether allowed, this is true in a measure. If God has commanded it, or it is a necessary thing, it is true; but if it is not commanded nor necessary, other circumstances should be taken into account. Thus with regard to this question: God instituted marriage so that it was to be the union of two persons alone, and not of more. . . . . . .

'In certain cases, however, a dispensation may be used,—as if a person taken captive in a foreign land should marry there, and on gaining his freedom should bring his wife with him,—or if long-continued sickness should supply a cause, as has been held at times with regard to lepers,—if in such cases a man takes another wife with the counsel of his pastor, not to introduce a law, but as a matter of necessity, such a man we could not condemn. Since, then, it is one thing to introduce a law, and another to use a dispensation, we humbly entreat your grace to consider, first, that care should in every way be taken that this matter be not brought publicly before the world as a law which everybody may follow. Next, since it is to be no law, but merely a dispensation, let your grace also consider the scandal, namely, that the enemies of the gospel would cry out that we are like the Anabaptists, who take several wives at once, and that the Evangelicals seek the liberty of taking as many wives as they please, according to the practice in Turkey. Again, what princes do, gets abroad much further than what is done by private persons. Again, if private persons hear of such an example in their lords, they desire that the like should be allowed to them; as we see how easily a practice spreads. . . . . . .

'Therefore let your grace, in consideration of all these causes, the offence, the other cares and labours, and the weakness of body, weigh this matter well. Be also pleased to consider that God has given your grace fair young princes and princesses with this consort, and be content with her, as many others must have patience under their marriage, to avoid offence. For that we should excite or urge your grace to an offensive innovation, is far from our mind. For your country and others might reproach us on account thereof, which would be intolerable to us, because we are commanded in God's word to regulate marriage and all human matters according to their first divine institution, and, so far as possible, to keep them therein, and to avert whatever may offend any one. Such, too, is now the way of the world, that people like to throw all the blame upon the preachers, if any thing unpleasant falls out; and men's hearts, among high and low, are unsteady; and all sorts of things are to be feared. But if your grace do not quit your unchaste life, for that you write that this is not possible, we would rather that your grace stood in better case before God, and lived with a good conscience, for your grace's happiness and the good of your country and people. If, however, your grace should at length resolve to take another wife, we think that this should be kept secret, as was said above of the dispensation; namely, that your grace, and the lady, with some confidential persons, should know your grace's mind and conscience through confession. From this no particular rumour or scandal would arise; for it is not unusual for princes to have concubines; and

Now this act of Luther's does not appear one which we need hesitate to judge. It is the act of deliberately permitting a Christian to have two wives, and thus deliberately violating the Christian code with respect to marriage. Marriage is by original institution monogamy: departure from that institution was allowed afterward, in condescension to man's weakness and hardness of heart; but Christianity reverted to it, and enforced it as an inviolable law;[1] and of this law Luther deliberately sanctioned the transgression. Nevertheless, as Archdeacon Hare has attempted an apology for this act of Luther's, it is due to him to see what he has to say. Archdeacon Hare then sums up his apology thus: 'Such is the amount of Luther's sin, or rather error,—for sin I dare not call it,—in this affair, in which the voice of the world, ever ready to believe evil of great and good men, has so severely condemned him, without investigation of the facts, although the motives imputed to him are wholly repugnant to those which governed his conduct through life. He did not compromise any professed principles, as the reviewer accuses him of doing: he did not inculcate polygamy, as the pamphleteer charges him with doing. But inasmuch as he could not discover any direct, absolute prohibition of polygamy in the New Testament, while it was practised by the Patriarchs, and recognised in the law, he did not deem himself warranted in condemning it absolutely, when there appeared in special cases to be a strong necessity, either with a view to some great national object, or for the relief of a troubled conscience. Here it behoves us to bear in mind, on the one hand, what importance Luther attached, as all his writings witness, to this high ministerial office of relieving troubled consciences: and it may mitigate our condemnation of his error,—which after all was an error on the right side, its purpose being to substitute a hallowed union for unhallowed license.'—Pp. 857, 858.

Now this defence holds good against one particular *inference*

---

although all the people would not know what the circumstances were, the intelligent would be able to guess them, and would be better pleased with such a quiet way of life, than with adultery and other wild and licentious courses. Nor are we to heed everything that people say, provided our consciences stand right. Thus far, and this we deem right. For that which is permitted concerning marriage in the law of Moses, is not forbidden in the Gospel.'—*Hare's Mission of the Comforter*, pp. 831 – 834.

[1] However the question of casuistry, with respect to the two wives of a heathen, brought with him at his conversion into the Christian Church may be disposed of, the decision will not at all affect the inviolability of the law of monogamy with respect to Christians. The *act* of bigamy, there, is a heathen act, and, therefore, however *ex post facto* dealt with, no precedent whatever for the act in a Christian.

which has been drawn from Luther's act. Sir William Hamilton appears to us hard upon Luther in charging him with a wish to promulgate polygamy, and in regarding this act as only the sanction, in a particular instance, of a practice which he desired at heart to establish generally. The whole language of the answer to the Landgrave shows that the liberty allowed him, was only allowed as a dispensation, and that the permitting authority was reluctant even to grant that: it indicated men feeling themselves under a difficulty: afraid of their own reputation if they gave leave, afraid of the Landgrave if they refused it; unable to reject polygamy as wrong in principle, and yet shrinking from it when threatened with the fact. But whatever becomes of Sir W. Hamilton's view, the *act* still remains to be excused—the act of allowing a particular person to have two wives; and what does the apologist say here? The substance of his apology is little more than a statement of the offence: Luther, he says, could not prohibit polygamy in an individual instance, *because* he did not think the Gospel absolutely prohibited polygamy. But the fact that Luther did not think so, is Luther's offence. Nobody could blame him for acting upon a view, if he had a true view: the charge is against his view to begin with: the view he held that polygamy was consistent with Christianity. The subordinate defences, suggested to take off from the edge of the offence, and 'mitigate our condemnation,' are hardly more fortunate. 'Luther,' the apologist tells us, 'attached great importance to the high ministerial 'office of relieving troubled consciences,' and in this particular case acted on that motive. Now it is difficult to see how the conscience of the Landgrave of Hesse can, except by a very lax use of the term, be put under the class of what are called 'troubled consciences.' The Landgrave said, 'If you do not 'allow me to have another wife, I shall only take the same 'liberty under another shape; and therefore you may as well 'allow me.' The matter of trouble to the Landgrave's conscience was not a past sin of which he wanted to repent, but a future sin which he intended to commit, if he had not a particular license given him. If to give such license for such a cause be called 'giving relief to a troubled conscience,' we see no reason why a license to break the whole of the ten commandments may not be given to persons upon their certifying beforehand that they intend to break them, whether they have the license or no; and why such general license should be refused the title of a general relief to troubled consciences. The validity of such an excuse entirely depends on the previous question, whether an act of polygamy is absolutely wrong or no in a Christian? If not in itself wrong, however inexpedient the general adoption might be, it is subject-matter of dispensation, and a considerate spiritual guide may allow it in a particular case, in order to preserve a person from committing what is wrong. But if an act of polygamy is absolutely wrong in a Christian, to allow it in order to save him from doing what is wrong, is as bad reasoning as it is loose morality. A man who cannot submit to the law of monogamy, may or may not be a tolerable heathen, but he is not a Christian, and has no right to belong to the Church of Christ upon earth. And to accommodate Christian law to him, in order that it may be said that he does not break Christian law, is to injure Christianity, and to do him no good. Indeed, the reason why the permission was given, which in Archdeacon Hare's opinion so mitigates the offence of giving it, appears to us strongly to aggravate it. For what was the ground of the permission? Was it one of those eccentric and unlooked-for reasons which occur once or twice in the world in the course of a century? No: the Landgrave urged no reason but what a thousand men in every city of Christendom might urge the next day. His one and sole reason was that his present wife was a disagreeable person, and that he wanted another: he gave no grounds but that of simple desire on his part, that the indulgence should be allowed. Differing from Sir William Hamilton, in the view that Luther *wished* to promote general polygamy, we must yet say that the fact of the permission of a particular case of it, on such a ground as this, was a precedent for the widest spread of it; for what was there to stop the operation of a precedent which admitted simple strong desire as a sufficient reason? Whatever Luther wished, his *act* was a generally unsettling one, and capable of bearing the largest and most systematic results in the way of innovation.

Nor can we admit, again, a comparison, which the apologist institutes between the conduct of a divine who sanctions an act of polygamy, and that of one who connives at licentiousness; a comparison which he decides in favour of the former. However much to blame Luther was,—says Archdeacon Hare,—he was not so much to blame as Bossuet; for Bossuet connived at much greater immorality in Louis XIV. than Luther sanctioned in Philip of Hesse. But there is a fallacy in this reasoning; for, were it granted that Louis XIV.'s immorality was worse than that of Philip of Hesse's, and that Bossuet connived at it, the act of sanctioning is a different genus of offence altogether from the act of connivance; and to sanction a less crime is much worse than to connive at a greater. If a person commits a wrong act, and another does not rebuke him for it, the latter is guilty of not asserting the truth; but if he *sanctions* the same, or a much smaller offence in him, he asserts an untruth, and calls that right which is not right. If Bossuet connived, he acted wrong, but he only committed himself; Luther, in sanctioning, committed Christianity. Still less do we see any mitigation of Luther's act, in the confidence, spirit, and self-possession with which he took the disclosure of it, when that was made:—

> 'However severely,' says Archdeacon Hare, 'we may blame Luther for these errors of judgment, for his allowing himself to be influenced in such a matter by *misericordia* and *humanissima facilitas*, still, when the secret is disclosed, when the scandal gets wind, how does the heroic grandeur of his character, the might of his invincible faith, rise out of the trial! The rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon his house: but it stood fast, because it was founded upon a Rock.'
>
> * * * * *
>
> 'In a beautiful letter, written in the following month of June, 1540, to Melancthon, who was grievously oppressed by the scandal occasioned when the Landgrave, in opposition to their counsel, let his second marriage be known, Luther thus reminds him of the principles which had guided them in their opinion. [We omit the quotation.] In this time of trouble Luther's heroic faith shines forth still more brightly from its contrast with Melancthon's weakness. The latter was quite crushed, and brought to the very verge of death. Luther, on the other hand, feels strong as ever from his unshaken trust in his Heavenly Supporter. "Quare frustra nos occidimus" (he says in the letter, just quoted, to Melancthon), "aut tristitia impedimus cognitionem victoris illius omnium mortium et tristitiarum? Qui enim vicit Diabolum, et judicavit principem hujus mundi, nonne et cum eo judicavit et vicit hoc scandalum? Nam si etiam hoc præsens scandalum desinat, dabit deinde alias, et forte majores turbas scandalorum, quas, si vivimus, in eodem tamen victore vincemus, et ridebimus quoque. Nihil est malorum vel inferni de quo ille non dixerit et voluerit sese intelligi, *Ego vici mundum, confidite.*—Valeat Satan; propter ipsum nec mœreamus, nec tristemur: in Christo autem Domino lætemur et exultemus: ipse deducet in nihilum omnes inimicos nostros. Nondum sumus in Davidis exemplo, cujus causa longe desperatior fuit, nec tamen cecidit: nec ista causa cadet. Cur ergo te maceras, cum finalis causa stet certe, id est, victoria Christi, etsi formalis et media nonnihil deformetur isto scandalo?—Nos, qui te sincere amamus, diligenter et efficaciter orabimus. Vale in Christo, et noli timere nec solicitari. Omnem solicitudinem in eum projicias, qui vult esse pro nobis solicitus, idque credi jussit et exigit.—Stabit illud: *Ego vici mundum: et vos vivetis quia Ego vivo.* Iterum vale, et sis lætus et quietus, oro, sicut petimus, imo sicut præcipit Dominus." This is the man whom the reviewer audaciously charges with a "skulking compromise of all professed principle," and with violating the Gospel, "trembling only at discovery."
>
> 'The reluctance to have the matter known, it is plain, was unmixed with any personal consideration in Luther; though it was otherwise with Melancthon, whose utter abashment on this occasion shows how thoroughly Luther understood his character, when he said to him years before, *Pecca fortiter*. It was just after this last letter of Luther's, that Melancthon, as he tells Camerarius in the words just cited, was at the very point of death, and was restored to life in an almost miraculous manner, as it seemed, by the intensely fervent prayers, and the energetic friendly comfort and friendly rebukes of Luther. When Luther, who had been sent for on account of

Melancthon's dangerous illness, arrived, he found, the historian tells us, "that his eyes were sunk, his senses gone, his speech stopped, his hearing closed, his face fallen in and hollow, and, as Luther said, *facies erat Hippocratica.* He knew nobody, ate and drank nothing. When Luther saw him thus disfigured, he was frightened above measure, and said to his companions, 'God forfend! how has the devil defaced this Organon!' He then turned forthwith to the window, and prayed fervently to God. 'Then,' said Luther, 'Our Lord God could not but hear me; for I threw my sack before his door, and wearied his ears with all his promises of hearing prayers, which I could repeat out of Holy Writ; so that He could not but hear me if I were ever to trust in his promises.' Hereupon he grasped Philip by the hand: '*Bono animo esto, Philippe; non morieris.* Although God has reason to slay, yet He willeth not the death of a sinner, but that he should be converted and live. He has pleasure in life, not in death. If God called and received the very greatest sinners that ever were upon earth, Adam and Eve, again into favour, much less will He reject thee, my Philip, or let thee perish in sin and despair. Therefore give no place to the spirit of sorrow, and be not thine own murderer; but trust in the Lord, who can slay and make alive again.' For Luther well knew the burthen of his heart and conscience. Being thus taken hold of and addressed, Philip began to draw breath again, but could not say anything for a good while. Then he turned his face straight upon Luther, and began to beg him for God's sake not to detain him any longer; that he was now on a good journey; that he should let him go; that nothing better could befall him. 'By no means, Philip,' said Luther; 'thou must serve our Lord God yet longer.' Thus Philip by degrees became more cheerful, and let Luther order him something to eat; and Luther brought it himself to him, but Philip refused it. Then Luther forced him with these threats, saying: 'Hark, Philip, thou must eat, or I excommunicate thee.' With these words he was overpowered, so that he ate a very little; and thus by degrees he gained strength again." See the account cited by Bretschneider in his Edition of Melancthon, IV. p. xvii. I enter into these details of Luther's conduct connected with this affair, because it has often been represented as utterly disgraceful and destructive of his moral character; whereas on this, as on every other occasion, the best vindication of him is the truth. The more one knows of him, the grander he becomes, the more, too, he wins not merely reverence, but love.'

The power of mind which this passage discloses in Luther is, we admit, very great, and it stands out, unquestionably, in strong relief, by the side of the feebleness of Melancthon. But it is a question whether, under such circumstances, Melancthon's feebleness is not a more creditable state of mind than Luther's power. The power which Luther shows is the power of putting a good face upon a bad business, and braving out an awkward step once taken. He says to himself, It cannot be helped now, we must make the best of it; and he does make the best of it, and carries off the act with a swing. Such a power shows a strong, forcible character; but, before it is put forward as a defence of that act which elicited it, it ought to be carefully distinguished from that quality which, in common *parlance*, bears an unfavourable name. Luther was a great man; but the assurance of a great man must no more be admitted to atone for a wrong act, than that of a little man.

In judging of this act of Luther's, it is indeed difficult to distinguish how much of it belonged to speculative audacity, and how much to moral laxity. The subject of marriage, so far as it suggested questions for the intellect to decide upon, was an intellectual subject; and Luther approached it in that independent and audacious spirit in which he approached other matters of doctrine. He had a pleasure in invading an occupied ground; in theorizing where all had been considered settled; in clearing away old ideas, and laying down new ones. So far his impulse was a speculative one, and part of the charge of moral laxity is drained off into that of intellectual presumption. But with the speculative impulse there mingles, too evidently, moral laxity also. The general tone of Luther with respect to the particular department of morality here alluded to, where not positively offensive, is free and easy, and unbecoming the severity of a Christian. The excuses of a temper rudely frank, of a ready tongue always saying what came uppermost, and of an argumentative furor always pushing him to coarseness as a form of strength, might be excuses for defective strictness and delicacy on such a subject, were the defects those of language only: but the defects in Luther's case are more than these. It is not that he uses that coarseness of language which might be attributed to the age rather than to the individual; but he discloses mental levity and mental laxity on this subject. He plainly wants those severe ideas in relation to it which as a Christian he ought to have. With such an unfavourable context in Luther's general language to fall back upon, on the subject of the act now before us, we cannot but express our deep and sincere regret, that Archdeacon Hare should have undertaken the defence of such an act. He has conceived an unbounded admiration for Luther, and, having conceived it, his generosity impels him to defend Luther at all hazards. But in such a case, the maxim of being just before you are generous is well worthy of attention; and an apologist, however enthusiastic, should never defend his author beyond the point where the defence does justice to himself.

Some social and some doctrinal consequences of Luther's movement have now been exhibited; and we see the great author of the Reformation struggling, at every step, with disagreeable and ominous developments of his own act: coercing, recalling, denouncing, protesting; assailed and assailing; lamenting and persecuting; harassed with awkward questions; obliged to go farther than he wanted to go; and put in the position of a spectator of his own movement, anxiously and nervously watching results which were now, in a great degree, out of his hands. As events drove him more and more into this position, and he had more and more the pain of seeing consequences which he did not like, and yet could not help, taking place: as he had more and more to bear disgusts and feel weakness, he fell back considerably upon that melancholy in which he had commenced his career. Never for an instant flinching from the antagonistic or dogmatic side of his position; hurling mortal defiances on Rome to the last, and full of his own great fundamental doctrine,—he yet could not shake off the inward sadness and vexation, which the ever rising facts of a general religious unsettlement, appealing to his eyes and ears, caused. And the melancholy of his character, so powerful as a stimulus at the commencement of his career, was prolific of disgusts toward the close.

Luther's melancholy is a feature in him, which there happens to be an especial call to notice, on account of some extraordinary and eccentric shapes which it at times assumed, and its connexion with those grotesque scenes of supernaturalism which figure so prominently in some parts of his life. Luther had then what is called a natural and constitutional melancholy. There is a kind of melancholy, which we call natural and constitutional, which acts upon no discernible cause but simply because it exists, and is an original disposition of the mind, in connexion with the bodily constitution. Again, there is a rational melancholy, which refers itself consciously to causes—more especially that great fundamental one, the existence of evil in the world: which is ever before it in the shape of one or other of its particular results, one or other painful, disgusting, or humiliating, event. Both of these kinds of melancholy enter into the composition of what is called a melancholy temperament; and both of them are in principle suitable and becoming to such a creature as man, in such a world as the present one. Those partial obscurations of nature, and ebbings of the animal spirits, which constitute natural melancholy, so far from being in themselves mere awkwardnesses and inappropriate interruptions, fall in harmoniously with a perishable state: they are natural anticipations of the final withdrawal of that gift of life which awaits all creatures here; —fit tremblings of that which is one day to fall, and vanishings of that which is one day to expire. Thus the Psalmist pictures even the inferior creatures as sometimes feeling a cloud over their spirits, and suffering obscurations of their animal life—foreshadowing its final departure: '*When Thou hidest Thy face they* '*are troubled:* when Thou takest away their breath they die, 'and are turned again to their dust:' and the picture elevates and dignifies rather than lowers the inferior creatures in our eyes. That melancholy, also, which is the offspring of thought and perception, is becoming in its place; and the total want of it argues an insensibility to certain obvious facts connected with this visible system. Luther's melancholy, then, is not in itself an unpleasing feature; it rather appeals to our sympathies. We see him, in spite of his uproarious hilarity, and overflowing and successful energy of mind, not a happy man. *Post equitem sedet atra cura:* he drives the chariot of the Reformation with fury, but he has a lingering gloom at heart. Even his fury is partly a remedial one, indulged as a balance and quietus to a strong natural counter sadness. And his immoderate mirth and flow of spirits sit often but superficially upon him, covering and relieving an inwardly vexed and troubled mind, rather than representing a light one.

But it is evident that melancholy, like other mental passions and affections, should be under the control of reason. The passion of anger is in itself a noble and lofty one, and yet is liable to run into coarseness and madness, unless it is checked by a higher principle. The melancholic tendencies of the human character, however deep and true a part of it, must in the same way be kept in check by a higher principle. Christian reason, *i. e.* faith, informs us that this whole system of things, notwithstanding the disturbing appearances in it, will finally issue in absolute good. Christian reason, therefore, forbids vague, irregular, and licentious melancholy. From the ultimate height of a certain issue it controls the commotions and depressions, the darkness and troubles, of passionate and sensitive nature. It brings the melancholy of the human character into form and shape; chastens, subdues, and refines it. Go over in succession the portraits of those great religious men upon whom the world has tried all its discouragements and disappointments, and see if in any one of them there appears a symptom of loose submission to the involuntary depressions of nature. Melancholy, indeed, appears, but it is a melancholy of perfect form and mould; tranquil, grave, and self-possessed, as if a sculptor had modelled it. You see this distinctive fact, that in their case the mind was above its own melancholy, looked down calmly upon it as an inferior part of itself; kept it under, and reduced it to order and law. You see that, conversing and living in heart with the One Eternal Substance of Good, they were not liable to be unsettled and confounded at the appearances of evil.

But Luther could not check or control his melancholic temperament; and it consequently rose into morbid excesses, got the upper hand, and became oppressive and overwhelming. He describes himself as suffering often horrible fits of despair.

Nay, he even incorporated these loose and degrading prostrations into his system, and tested the religious advancement of the believer by them. Does he feel occasionally desperate, all ground of faith gone, and the world, the flesh, and the devil triumphant?—if so, he is a child of God; if not, he is without his proper Christian evidences and tokens. Such melancholy as this was a loose, disordered one—a mere cowering before the principle of evil; for nobody can despair, even of his own personal salvation, without a slavish succumbing for the time to evil, as if it had, in his own case at any rate, a necessary domination. Luther indeed could not control his melancholy, because he did not discipline himself. The first thing which a man of a melancholic temperament ought to do, if he wants to keep that temperament in order, is to practise some self-discipline. Many great men have had exactly the same constitution as Luther, and have controlled it by this means. But Luther did not discipline himself; his life was egregiously defective on that head. He vented his humours unscrupulously, used his tongue immoderately; ate and drank freely, and did generally what he liked. With many generous and noble gifts, he was not a self-disciplinarian; and he suffered for it. If the antagonist to melancholy is hope, we have the word of an apostle for the truth, that this hope can only come by experience, and that this experience can only come by practice. It is impossible that a man can have real substantial hope, *i.e.* belief in the ultimate triumph of good over evil, who does not feel and experience that triumph to some extent in himself. How can we reason but from what we know? One who is conquering evil in himself has actually working within him a portion of that very victorious spirit itself which is to conquer universal evil; and, believing in the expansion of what he actually feels, he has hope. But if a man lets himself run wild, or lie fallow, this sensible ground of hope is gone; and he will be liable to fall into melancholy. Hope and practice act and re-act upon each other: hope is a stimulus to practice; practice is the foundation of hope. On the other hand, a lax habit of mind protrudes an indefinite gloom before it, and license is compensated for by melancholy.

But Luther's habit became worse than morbid. The reader may qualify it as he likes, but there is a truth contained in a summary dictum with respect to a particular class of minds;—that they cannot be melancholy without being mad. Cromwell's melancholy ran into eccentricities and monkey tricks: 'starting 'from his bed in the dead of the night, and troubled strangely 'with "phansies about the cross" of Huntingdon, he would, 'after an interval, suddenly plunge into fantastic shapes of 'merriment.' It seems invidious to allude to the amiable Cowper: at the same time he is an instance of a person in whom a melancholy madness seems to have had its full swing, and to have encountered no counteracting power in his mind. The religion of the Church does appear to have a power of shaping and ordering the melancholy of the human mind, while inferior religions too often let it grow into more or less of insanity. Luther alludes in his Table-talk to temptations he had felt to commit suicide: 'Sometimes when I have had a knife in my hand, terrible thoughts have come upon me.' His melancholy revelled in a coarse supernaturalism, and summoned grotesque phantoms from the lower world. He spoke of one being as constantly near him, not in the sense in which he is near all men, as mankind's great tempter, but in some extraordinary and local way. It is needless to introduce here the well-known stories which describe Luther's intimate and continual intercourse with the devil: many of them are not fit for these pages, and anybody who has the curiosity may read them collected, with the greatest attention to his convenience, in the sixth chapter of the book of M. Michelet's 'Life.' It is enough to say, that Luther speaks of a repeated local and sensible presence of the devil, manifesting himself by sight, words, and even by touch. We speak of his language. How far such language may be metaphorical sometimes, notwithstanding its simple and matter-of-fact surface, we will not undertake to determine. Luther sometimes alludes to the ordinary operations of nature as those of the devil, and expresses in words a personal presence of that being where, from the nature of the case, he could hardly really mean it. 'One day when there was a great storm 'abroad, Luther said: "'Tis the devil who does this; the winds 'are nothing else but good and bad spirits. Hark! how the 'devil is puffing and blowing."' So in another instance, an ordinary accident is attributed to the personal agency of the devil, simply because it is an awkward one, and because he seems to consider that all awkward events proceed from the devil, as the evil principle. As he was uniting Duke Philip of Pomerania and the Elector's sister, in the middle of the marriage ceremony the nuptial ring escaped from his hold. He was seized with temporary alarm, but soon recovering himself exclaimed: 'Hark ye, devil, this is no affair of mine! 'tis all lost time for thee.' Everything or person, in short, which offended Luther was the devil in Luther's eyes:—To Carlstadt, 'I know thee, devil of mine.' To the Anabaptists—'Well, good devil, what next?' The use of the name was a vent for his irritability, and answered for him a purpose very analogous to that which it answers among the vulgar. It was a form of swearing;

though differing widely from ordinary swearing, in being significant, and connected with a general view. He had a strong sense of abstract evil; he retaliated on all offensive matter by referring it immediately to this evil: and a religious philosophy mixed with the temper of common vituperation. Such passages as these suggest a doubt how far Luther's relation of any sensible acts and presence of Satan is real or metaphorical. His language admits sometimes of a simply vituperative, sometimes of a simply imaginative meaning, while the surface is a matter-of-fact one; and Luther betrays a prophetic sympathy with that peculiarly German line of thought which, spreading personality on the largest scale throughout nature, and making individuals of winds, trees, and brooks, leaves the reader in doubt all the time, whether the personality which the story intends is a real or practical one. On the other hand, he evidently held with great pertinacity to the old popular legends of sensible Satanic agency; and his allusions have generally a matter-of-fact tone which it is difficult to explain away. He describes himself, then, as in this close and intimate intercourse with the devil; the devil presses him with arguments, draws him out of rooms, forces him out of bed, and throws him into perspirations. 'I 'know the devil thoroughly well: he has often had very hard '*hold of me*, but he has been obliged to let me go at last: he has 'over and over again pressed me so close that I hardly knew 'whether I was alive or dead.' These attacks aimed at his faith; they 'threw him sometimes into such despair that he 'did not know whether there was a God, and had great doubts 'of the Lord Jesus Christ;' and he referred to them afterwards as 'agonies,' with the same pride with which a soldier refers to his battles. The celebrated midnight disputation with the devil at the castle of Wartburg, which need not be more than alluded to here, was one of these. In that interview the accuser threw in his teeth all his compliances with the established superstitions during his days of ignorance, and especially his celebration of the mass; and a long argument against the mass is put into the devil's mouth. We will take this opportunity of correcting a mistake of M. Audin and some others with respect to this argument. M. Audin regards it as a genuine theological argument on the part of the devil, carried on with the object of disproving the doctrine of the mass; and makes it a confession on Luther's part, that he and the devil agreed together in opinion. It is impossible, of course, that Luther could mean this; because, by such a confession he would be *ipso facto* confessing himself in the wrong with respect to his theology; and this, it is unnecessary to say, he never did. The devil in this interview does not argue as a theologian, but as an accuser; nor is the conclusion of the erroneousness of the mass his object, but the proof, through that conclusion, of Luther's sin in having celebrated it. An offence must be proved to be such before the offender is convicted in consequence: and the devil argues for the sinfulness of the mass, as he would for that of any moral offence, not in order to express a theological view in the one case, or a moral view in the other, but in order to compass a conviction of the man. The function of accuser is always the principal one assigned to Satan by Luther: the devil 'is always placing before 'his eyes the law, sin and death, and makes use of this triad to 'torment him,' '*Est mirabilis artifex aggravandi peccatum*;' 'he 'goes on with the old story, accusing him of sin:' and in this capacity of accuser he visited Luther at Wartburg.

Upon those personal conflicts with Satan, and the character of Christian trials which Luther attributes to them, one remark is to be made. That is unquestionably an absurd and dangerous view, which in any degree tends to divert attention from the substantial trials of substantial life, to an eccentric and indescribable class of trials. The great trials of life are of one substantial class: 'Every man is tempted,' says S. James, 'when he is drawn away of his own lust and 'enticed.' The medium of ordinary nature is the medium through which our trial comes; and the temptations of life lie in the every-day lusts, appetites, and passions, which we carry about with us in our own bodies and minds. If any view of Christian warfare draws us away from these, as the great, difficult, and arduous trials of life, there is no necessity to ask another question: the view must be absurd. But Luther's view goes far to produce this result. He has a certain class of irregular and unintelligible—not to say, ridiculous—trials, which he sets up as the great ones of Christian life; far above the ordinary ones, of which he speaks quite slightingly in comparison: 'The temptation of the flesh is a small matter; 'but God defend us from the great temptations which touch 'upon eternity; when we are beaten about among them, we 'know not whether God is the devil, or the devil God:' that is to say, he asserts, that these irregular and eccentric 'agonies' we are speaking of; these sensible personal assaults of Satan, producing fright and perspiration, are much more serious and important trials than the temptations of the flesh. A more absurd and debasing view of human trial could not well be conceived. The devil is indeed, as we know from Scripture, our great enemy. But that mighty and dreadful being, to whom of all the fallen creatures of God, the wisdom of the serpent first belonged, knows better than to assail the human race by the mere frightening and overwhelming power of a local and direct presence. He assails us through that machinery of the flesh and the world by which we are surrounded; and through that medium gets access to the real substantial man. To appear and to frighten, is child's play; power which acts formidably, acts through a medium. The world's great tempter made a common local assailant of, loses his dreadful character, and becomes, as the legendary stories, and as the style of Luther's own remarks upon him, abundantly indicate, a laughing-stock. The weight of invisibility taken off, the human mind is at ease, and can amuse itself, and joke at his expense. This constant intercourse with a sensible Satan, and the elevation of this form of temptation above the substantial and natural ones, have their fruits in Luther's life. While he was attending to the trials which made him perspire, he neglected those which made him rage and vilify; and the temptations of the flesh, of which he thought so slightingly, in some degree vindicated their position.

Of the melancholic habit of Luther's mind, thus rough, grotesque, unshaped, undisciplined, there was another and an important development. To one system or theory undisciplined melancholy generally goes to satisfy and quiet itself: and that is fatalism. The theory of fatalism has this peculiar attraction, that by one single simple idea, which occupies no more space than a needle's point in the mind, it accounts for all things that ever were or can be, the whole medley of this visible system—the one idea, viz. of '*must.*' As an artificial goal to the intellect, the fatalist theory is eminently great and satisfying. Luther was a fatalist: that is to say, he was an extreme predestinarian: not a believer in simple blind fate, he persisted in carrying out the one truth of God's foreknowledge into all its logical consequences, without qualification from other truths. He took his stand on the idea of Deity, and argued thus.—The idea of Deity implies absolute and omnipotent predestination; free will is contrary to predestination: therefore free will is contrary to the idea of Deity. He first defined free will as licentious, and insulting to the Divine prerogative, and then condemned it as such. To allow man free will and mastery over his own actions, was to give the Deity nothing to do but to stand by an idle spectator of the world's course, waiting for a chance issue; to convert him into an '*idolum Fortunæ,*' a god like Homer's, who was absent from his government because he had gone to dine with the Ethiopians. This was impossible; therefore man could not have free will and mastery over his own actions.[1] He then carried his theory through the opposition of facts, and the repugnancy of nature. Allowing the phenomenon of free will, he explained it as being a phenomenon only, and not a reality. We are not dragged by the neck, he says, to do things which we hate: we do voluntarily that which we will to do, but that very will is a necessary will, and not a free one.[1]

---

[1] 'Liberum arbitrium nemini nisi soli Deo convenit. Arbitrium fortassis homini aliquod recte attribuis, sed liberum arbitrium tribuere in rebus divinis nimium

There is not seldom in Luther's air, action, language, that which, when once our attention has caught it, carries us back to these ideas of fatalism. A careless ease, an *abandon*, a species of indifference, as if not he but some external power were acting, appears. Retrospects of life have generally, indeed, something of a dreamy tone about them; and yet that tone in Luther's attracts our attention. ‘My father went to Mansfeldt, and became a miner there. It was there I was born. That I was afterwards to become bachelor of arts, doctor of divinity, and what not, was assuredly not written in the stars, at least, not to ordinary readers. How I astonished everybody when I turned monk! and again, when I exchanged the brown cap for another. These things greatly vexed my father—nay, made him quite ill for a time. After that, I got pulling the pope about by the hair of his head; I married a runaway nun; I had children by her. Who saw these things in the stars? Who would have told any one beforehand they were to happen?' Again, it is often difficult to discriminate between what is positive energy and what is a negative abandonment of himself to a swing. Much of the actual strength of his style, for instance, seems to come from carelessness to what he says,

---

est. Quod liberi arbitrii vox omnium aurium judicio proprie id dicitur, quod potest et facit erga Deum quæcunque libuerit, nulla lege, nullo imperio cohibitum. Neque enim servum dixeris liberum qui sub imperio domini agit: quanto minus hominem vel Angelum recte liberum dicimus, qui sub imperio plenissimo Dei (ut peccatum et mortem taceam) sic degunt, ut nec momento consistere suis viribus possint.'—*Oper.* vol. ii. p. 442.

Again—

‘Nec patimur neque recipimus mediocritatem illam, quam nobis consulit bono, ut credo, animo; scilicet ut libero arbitrio perpusillum concedamus, quo facilius pugnantia Scripturæ et incommoda prædicta tollantur. Nam ista mediocritate nihil est causæ consultum neque quidquam profectum .... Ideo ad extrema eundum est, ut totum negetur liberum arbitrium, et omnia ad Deum referantur.'—*Oper.* vol. i. p. 475.

[1] ‘Necessario dico, non coacte sed necessitate immutabilitatis. Non violenter, velut raptus obtorto collo, nolens facit malum, sed sponte et libente voluntate facit. Verum hanc libentiam non potest suis viribus omittere, coercere, aut mutare, sed pergit volendo et libendo.'—*De Serv. Arbit. Oper.* vol. ii. p. 434.

‘Quid ad me si liberum arbitrium non cogatur sed volenter faciat quod facit? Sufficit mihi quod concedis necessario fore, ut volenter faciat, nec aliter habere se queat, si Deus ita præscierit.'—*Oper.* vol. ii. p. 463. The concession alluded to is the ‘necessitas consequentiæ,' or the predestination on God's part, which Erasmus of course allowed, but balanced by denying the ‘necessitas consequentiæ,' *i. e.* denying subsequent slavery of will on man's part. Luther takes his concession without the counterbalance to it.

and his vigour to have much to do with the absence of an internal check. The prodigious ease and freedom with which he made his observations upon men and things is that almost of an irresponsible person. His summary treatment of Scripture, bestowed with such an air of negligence, suggests the same remark. When he criticizes the Epistle of S. James, in the passage quoted above, and decides that it contains many excellent remarks, and that its author was doubtless a worthy man, though antiquated in his opinions; that he, Luther, did not consider him inspired, but had no objection to any one else considering him so who chose, we can almost suppose him dreaming, so little does he seem to realize the shock he is giving to Christian faith. Luther's career, with all its activities, betrays some features of the dream: and he seems to move with a self-moving order of events. Thus he marries his Catharine Bora rather as if he were dreaming. He seems hardly to know why he marries; no strong attachment to her, no call to marriage, generally, induces him. The step lowered him in his own estimation. No theory could make the marriage of a monk and a nun not ignominious; no theory could make it necessary for Luther to marry at all. To the apostle of a great religious movement, who had lived forty years of his life without marrying, the pleasures of a domestic life could not be necessary: and he had plenty to do without encumbering himself with its cares. Fate, however, brought them together: she came in his way, and he married her, feeling all the time the deep blow to his self-respect. He would fain have converted the humiliation into a matter of spiritual congratulation, and believed that 'devils wept and angels 'smiled' over it; but an injured self-respect disturbed him, and did not leave him easy even in the midst of the charms and affections of wife and home.

> 'Medio de fonte leporum
> Surgit amari aliquid quod in ipsis floribus angit.'

The stars were unusually brilliant one evening, when he and Catharine were walking in the garden. 'What a brilliant 'light!' said Luther, as he looked upward; 'but it burns not 'for us.' 'And why are we to be excluded from the kingdom 'of heaven?' asked Catharine. 'Perhaps,' said Luther, with a sigh, 'because we left our convents.' Catharine—'Shall we 'return then?' Luther—'It is too late to do that.'

To the consolatory side, then, of this melancholy and fatalist temper, Luther betook himself, as the Reformation, getting in its spread more and more out of his hands, cast up its various, ugly, and shapeless developments. He went on repeating to himself—'It must be; this is the way of the world; this is 'what was to be expected.' He reposed disdainfully in the general maxim of the unvarying ingratitude of human nature to all its benefactors, temporal and spiritual. Here had he been working all his life for the very persons who were now throwing him off, and setting up their own mongrel and vile fancies. He had suffered as well as worked; he had gone through all the dark, subterranean, preparatory gloom, by which a great movement is ushered in, and borne the weight of innumerable internal struggles, temptations, and depressions; and now men who had done nothing but enjoy the fruits, claimed the credit and usurped the authority. *Audaculi!* Fine boasters and braggers now that the result was obtained; how would they have gone through the task of obtaining it? What mental agonies had they had—those tokens of the Spirit—those only sure evidences of God's proving and chastening love? They could enjoy day and sunshine well enough, but had they felt the horrors of the night? However, ingratitude was the property of human nature: —'The world did not deserve to have anything done for it by men of heart and conscience.' Even his domestic distresses assumed the shape of results of this universal law. One of his sons was a disobedient boy. 'He almost killed me once, and ever since I have lost all my 'strength of body. Thanks to him, I now thoroughly under- 'stand that passage where S. Paul speaks of children who kill 'their parents, not by the sword, but by disobedience. Such 'children seldom live long, and are never happy. . . . . Oh, 'God! how wicked is this world! how monstrous the times in 'which we live! These are the times of which Christ said, '*When the Son of Man cometh shall he find faith on the earth?* 'Happy they who died ere these days came upon the world?' The days were come, to which the prophecy—'My Spirit 'shall not always strive with men,' pointed; the last punishment which God through the mouth of the holy patriarchs threatened, was now in execution; and Germany was specially feeling it. 'See how Satan hasteneth and busieth himself; 'what troops of sects he hath raised against us! and what is to 'happen when I die? What hosts of Sacramentaries, Ana- 'baptists, Antinomians, Servetians, Campanistæ, and heretics of 'all kinds will arise?' He questioned even whether the Bible itself would long keep its hold. 'There was commencing in 'the world a weariness of the word of God; a sign of ill 'promise. One of these days some new books would be started 'in competition, and the Bible be despised, slighted, pushed 'into a corner and thrown under the table.' He thought, as persons have often done when events have disturbed them, and hopes have been disappointed, that the end of the world was approaching. ‘In December last, the whole heavens were seen ‘on fire above the church of Breslau; and another day, there ‘were witnessed in the same place two circles of fire, one within ‘the other, and in the centre of them a blazing pillar. These ‘signs announce, it is my firm opinion, the approach of the last ‘day. The empire is falling, kings are falling, princes are falling, the whole world totters, and, like a great house about to ‘tumble down, manifests its coming destruction by wide gaps ‘and crevices on its surface. This will infallibly happen, and ‘ere long.’—‘The hour of midnight approaches, when the cry ‘will be heard, Behold, the Bridegroom cometh, go ye out ‘to meet Him.’

Under the vexation, annoyance, and sense of ill-usage which the medley of earthly events produces in those who have taken a prominent part in them, the mind often takes refuge in the idea of an end. It retaliates on its own discomforts by a keen realizing of the absolute ultimate cessation of that system of things which produces them; and brings in the future to annihilate the present. That which *will* once be quite certainly over, seems substantially over *now*, and to exist only by accident, and not in the nature of things. The consolatory powers of this idea are to a certain extent, indeed, sanctioned by Scripture; and the prophetical parts of the Old Testament, and almost all parts of the New, direct us in some way to them. The idea of an end again suggests the idea of that end shortly approaching: we realize the certainty of it by imagining its vicinity. Thus, from the beginning of Christianity downwards, the pious notion has ever more or less prevailed in the Church that the end of the world was shortly approaching: and even Apostles seem to have entertained it. Among the primitive Christians it was general; in every age of the Church any alarming posture of affairs, any general calamity, political, ecclesiastical, or physical, has been sufficient to elicit it, and we see the tendency even in our own times. Luther took refuge, then, in this idea: but he did so morbidly and angrily. He embraced it in the spirit of a person who felt an actual private interest, and private pique gratified by its accomplishment. A great movement of his own was producing many bad effects, and promising many worse: and he was disappointed, and he was apprehensive. There is something remarkable in the way in which Luther seems not to have been able to throw himself confidently upon the good part of human nature, for taking in and carrying out his system as he wished. Some founders of systems have been able to do this; they have said to themselves: This system will do its work well; many will abuse it, but, on the whole, the good part of human nature will be in alliance with it, and carry it out with substantial success. Luther had no solid good part of human nature to depend on in this way; his theory made of man a broken reed only, and he could not trust him for doing anything like justice to his ideas. He had no pledge for events, and saw wildness and disorder before him. A general gloom as to the future thus hung over the latter part of his life. First, he distrusted it, and secondly, he cut it short. Insecure as to the ultimate issues of a great movement, the actual contents of the womb of time, the rising attitude of human thought; alarmed at symptoms, repelled by facts, he relieved his prospect by closing it up. He placed a dead wall before his eyes, and saw nothing beyond it. He fixed his imagination on an end, and wound up the hopeless disorders of a hopeless scene in an immediate day of judgment.

In this sketch of Luther's character and career we have omitted, or but incidentally alluded to, one striking side of him, and attended to the deeper rather than to the lighter features. We have seen him as a religious enthusiast, with the natural melancholy and the profound emotions which attach to such a character: and we have seen him as a practical man,—a shrewd, energetic, and statesmanlike leader and reformer. Another and a lighter part of him yet remains; but it falls so naturally under the concluding head of this article, to which we are now arrived, that we shall not interrupt the order of our remarks to introduce it previously.

One not unimportant inquiry then comes in, as a natural appendage or conclusion to this article; and that is, what consequences Luther has left behind him of his own peculiar religious mould, and how far he has managed to impress himself upon posterity: what ethical effects (for to go into all the effects would be too large an inquiry for our limits) survive of so wonderful a religious phenomenon.

First, then, we turn to the nation to which Luther belonged, and to which his labours were devoted, and ask how far Luther has impressed himself upon that nation, and left his own type visible in it. Turning to that nation we certainly see a peculiar type of character. The resident in Germany sends home his description of it: German literature and German poetry in a great degree bear their own witness to it. We see first, as a feature in the German character, a deep genial appreciation of the social and cheerful side of human life. The German is warm and hearty, full of lively feelings and affections, and most powerfully susceptible of that happiness which proceeds from their gratification. He enters into social and family life with a poetical enthusiasm, and endows the affections of nature with peculiar life and intensity. A peculiar appreciation of nature herself is also apparent in him. The German descriptive poet forms with the beauty and splendour, the life and fertility, of nature an intimacy, and derives from them an enjoyment which no poet except himself, or one who has caught his spirit, does. He feels nature mingling with his soul, and conversing with him: he gives her an almost personal life. Trees, herbs, and flowers, the winds and waves, the storm and sunshine, the clouds and sky, black forest and fertile field, mountain and plain, valley and rock, and all the animal life which inhabits them, speak and hold communion with him as if they were intelligent things. But with this genial and overflowing appreciation of nature, animate and inanimate, the world physical and social, there mingles a subtle spirit which ensnares and corrupts. The forms of feeling are too luxuriant to be solid, and too expanded to be safe. The love of all natural things, matter or mind, needs reserve to keep it pure and healthy; and a cautious policy is as necessary in the world of feeling as it is in that of action. Wisdom speaks one language here—Hold back; distrust: 'Know thyself,' and be sure that all is sound, before the valve is opened. Caution is an actual part of true feeling, a substantial ingredient in its nature; as in chemistry one gas often enters into the composition of another. Those sacred poets of the old pagan world who sung the praises of *αἰδώς* taught this lesson: they taught that there was something in human nature higher than mere feeling, a holy monitor to whom all affection was meant to bow, and absolutely commit itself for training and fashioning. This lesson old pagan philosophy, though with the repulsive and daring exaggeration incident to human thinking, taught; when stoic and cynic warned men of their feelings, as if they were mere perturbations and diseases. The social feeling of the German overleaps this caution; and the popular fiction which describes German life betrays the fault. The social interior exhibited there is one in which the affections of nature luxuriate and exceed: there is a flood of mutual devotion; minds are wrapped up in each other, with an apparent forgetfulness that there are other people in the world beside themselves; an elysian self-importance pervades the scene, and we are merged in a central whirlpool of interest and emotion. Such a luxuriance is too great to stand; the scene approaches too nearly to the sensual; head and heart swim; and finally one infallible symptom of disease appears in the shape of one prevailing fault to which all point as the blot on German social life. Too wildly and fiercely intent on a legitimate happiness, feeling runs into illegitimate, and finds the law of fidelity too tight a chain. Undisciplined love wanders restlessly; and self-indulgent fancy unsettles the stableness, and stains the sanctity of domestic life. The German appreciation of nature equally overleaps this caution; and if it has the merits of an overflowing enthusiasm, plunges deep into the dangers too. The poet adores a perishing external surface, as if it were the substance; he falls before the rock or mountain as if it were a god; he breathes into nature a kind of personal divinity; he loves and thanks devoutly his mother-earth for her luxuriance and beauty, her tenderness and care: he idolizes the creature, and holds communion with a pantheistic deity, and universal soul.

The whole German development of feeling, poetical and social, amidst all that is deep and sympathetic in it, thus shows one great defect. In the love of nature, and of man alike, one principle, for which the Greek language has a consecrated name, is sadly overborne. Another and a looser spirit appears, the same of which we see the still more obvious fruits in the direct department of theology; the same which has explained away inspiration, reduced the Bible to legend, dissolved the Christian creed, and left a void for the human to fill up at its will. Emptied of the preserving element of *ἀιδώς*, no wonder that nature turns to rankness, and feeling to disease—that a hollow luxuriance betrays itself; that there is sin, and as surely as there is sin, failure and disappointment. Christianity has developed within the human heart a vast and boundless desire for happiness, a noble longing passion to which the pagan world was comparatively strange: but alas for those who forget the source from which they received the passion, and, throwing religious awe aside, try to satiate it with earth and nature! Nature tasked beyond her powers, gives way, and shows her hollowness when made divine. To them no sights or sounds of earth, however lovely; no beauty of land, or sky, or sea; no human sympathies and affections, will give even an ordinary traveller's repose. They have grasped at too much, and the treasure slips out of their hand. With all its elevation of nature's beatific powers, and tenderness to her children, few will say that the poetry of the German worshippers of nature, or of their school amongst ourselves, leaves, on the whole, a cheerful impression on the reader's mind. Amidst the glories of the landscape, and beneath the full meridian sun itself, faint sighs are heard, and wailing notes float past upon the breeze.

> 'When on the threshold of the green recess
> The wanderer's footsteps fell; he knew that death
> Was on him . . . . he did place
> His pale lean hand upon the ragged trunk
> Of the old pine. Upon an ivied stone
> Reclined his languid head: his limbs did rest,
> Diffused and motionless, on the smooth brink

> Of that obscurest chasm :—and thus he lay
> Surrendering to their final impulses
> The hovering powers of life. Hope and Despair,
> The torturers, slept : no mortal pain or fear
> Moved his repose. The influxes of sense ;
> And his own being unalloyed by pain,
> Yet feebler, and more feeble, calmly fed
> The stream of thought, till he lay breathing there
> At peace, and faintly smiling :—his last sight
> Was the great moon, which o'er the western line
> Of the wide world her mighty horn suspended,
> With whose dun beams inwoven darkness seemed
> To mingle.[1]

Such are the thoughts in which the disappointed passion for happiness takes refuge; the consolations of a mind which has drunk too deep, and come to the dregs—which has found the hollowness of mere nature by trying her too much, and discovered decay and death amid her luxuriance and beauty.

The fund of amiableness and heartiness in Luther's character is as striking a fact about it as any other, public or private: and that is saying a great deal. It does show indeed a marvellous richness of the social affections and sympathies. It is a luxuriant and a glowing character; nor did fatalism interfere with it, but rather helped to expand it. There are two kinds of fatalism, dogmatical and poetical. The dogmatical is rigid: the poetical is careless. Calvin's fatalism was dogmatical, and gave the formal mould, and gloomy gait, and sour physiognomy; and produced puritanism. Luther's fatalism was careless, and set him at his ease. It was a fatalism which soothed the feelings rather than deadened them, and softened the mind instead of souring it. It said, *Carpe diem:* evil will have its way, and you cannot prevent it, do what you will: do not afflict yourself then. There is a cycle of events, and you cannot disturb it. Acquiesce in it like a wise man. '*Sua hora cuique.*' '*Omnia habent suum tempus.*' If evil comes, then bear it: if good, enjoy it. 'Joy hath its hour, as all things else: let us enjoy the present, and not be tormented about the future. Even vices cannot be mended till the appointed hour of amendment comes.' The 'appointed hour' was a great word with Luther; and as, advancing into years, he looked back upon his past life, he surveyed with calm amusement many a struggle against (as he thought) fate and impossibility into which his youthful impatience had betrayed him. He observed, that his own efforts to correct his faults had never answered when they were untimely. And the same law applied to the treatment of evil in others too. 'When I was a young preacher, I seriously 'meditated making all mankind good;' but I have found out my mistake, he adds. So, when he was a young monk, he fretted himself at the injustice he saw going on all around him; but now he saw that injustice always had gone on, and always would go on in the world. He now, therefore, gave himself as little trouble as might be about the annoyances of life. 'What good 'would it do him to be vexing himself, for example, about the 'Sacramentaries and sectarians?' Thus, underneath a fatalist theory, an easy good nature grew and expanded; and warm sympathies, and a fascinating presence, had their full play. Bitter as wormwood to his foes, Luther was all heart and love to friends and those who went along with him. Let it only appear that a man had joined him, or made himself at all his dependant, and his generosity was boundless. Thus the genial liberality with which he relieved the crowds of poor students who came to his door, parting even with the accidental ornament off his table, the present of some prince, for money to give them. Thus the attention with which he would listen to poor people, with their stories of supernatural troubles and foes. An old lansknecht 'complained to him of the manner in which the devil 'constantly assailed him with temptations and threats of carrying him through the air.' 'A young farrier, had been giving 'out in the neighbourhood that he was haunted by a spectre. 'Luther sent for the young man.' Thus the social evenings at the 'Black Eagle at Wittemberg,' where amidst the rounds of the cup the 'Table-talk' was produced. The jovial and hearty equality on which he puts himself with others, endeared him to companions, as his compassion and charity did to his class of poor friends. Wholly without the airs of a great man, free as air, easy and welcome as home, he radiated social heartiness and comfort; and men were happy round him, as they are happy round a fire. The music of his tongue, the brilliancy and fertility of his humour, and all his social gifts and talents, delightful in themselves, were more delightful because they were his; and the dispenser of rich treats was himself the great treat of all. The unpretending plainness of his whole way of living, always bordering on actual poverty and want, but borne with the most cheerful indifference, was a constant memento in his favour. The leader of the age and the adviser of princes, affecting no station and courting no great men, was externally one of the common crowd, and the plainest of it. In domestic life, the same heart and nature appear. There he overflows with affection, warmth, tenderness; with all the amiable banter of the husband, and all the sweet arts and pretty nonsense of a father among his little children. Whether he is joking, soothing, lecturing his 'rib

---

[1] Shelley's Alastor.

Catharine,' his 'gracious dame Catharine,' or writing a description of fairyland and horses with silver saddles to his 'voracious, bibacious, loquacious' little John, or whether he is in the agony of grief over the deathbed of his favourite daughter Margaret, we see the same exuberant tender character. In his love of outward nature the same exuberance and liveliness appear. There is a quick poetical sensibility to the productive powers of nature, and the earth's fertility and verdure. The 'beautiful bough loaded with cherries' appealed to him; the amazing effects of spring, as he walked in his garden, raised overpowering emotion. 'Glory to God, who, from the dead crea-'tion, thus raises up life again in the spring-time. Behold these 'branches, how strong, how beautiful they are! Already they 'teem, and are big with the fruit which they will bring forth. 'They offer a beautiful image of the resurrection of all men. 'The winter season represents death; the summer-tide the 'resurrection. Then all things live again, all is verdant.' Thus a shower was delightful to him; it had a productive renovating power. 'A very violent storm occurred, followed by benefi-'cent showers, which restored verdure to the trees and 'the earth. Dr. Martin, turning his eyes towards heaven, 'said: "How lovely is this weather! Thou hast granted to 'us, O Lord, this bounty, to us who are so ungrateful to thee, 'so full of wickedness and avarice. But thou art a God of 'goodness! This is no work of the devil! No; it is a boun-'teous thunder which shakes the earth and rouses it, cleaving 'it, that its fruits may come forth and spread a perfume like 'to that which is diffused by the prayer of a pious Christian."' There is a peculiar play of fancy and humour, again, in his love of nature, which reminds us strongly of the fancy and humour of the modern German; and as he listens to the rooks at Wartburg, and imagines them holding a parliament, and debating, the picture of the grave black senators seems almost prophetic of the pages of Andersen. Luther's love of music was part of the same character. 'Music was the art of the 'prophets, and ranked next to theology; music alone could calm 'the agitations of the soul and put the devil to flight.' Too deep a lover of music to regard it as a mere amusement to the listener, accomplishment to the performer, he associated it with mind and moral feeling, and made it part of religion. He entered into the beauty of the world of sound, in the same deep sympathetic way in which he entered into the beauty of the world of sight. His taste for the arts and the *belles lettres*, from his early affection for Virgil and Plautus, to his acquaintance with Lucas Cranach, and the criticisms on languages, grammar, Latin writing, the drama, painting, universities, and education, in the

Table-talk, show the enlarged sympathy which says, *Nihil humanum a me alienum puto.*

But with all this richness and warmth of social and poetical nature in Luther, there was too evident a deficiency of that one spirit which could chasten and temper it. That one pledge of safety named above is wanting. While we admire the fulness of the domestic sensibilities in him, it is impossible to forget how he dealt with the first of the domestic relations; and the sermon *De Matrimonio*, and the licence to Philip of Hesse, haunt us at his very fireside. The domestic sympathies require a regimen; and home, if it is a sweet and welcome, should be a severe and sanctified place. Did Luther provide for that side of home? It cannot be said that he did. Without fastening on him all the logical consequences of his matrimonial theory, some looseness of feeling must be seen underneath it. The model of a severe Christian home could hardly have been in the mind of a man who preached that sermon, and gave that license. The naked claim of nature demanding the lawful lawlessly, speaks in that sermon and the Table-talk. The rude invasion of a sacred blessing was hardly not suggestive of a self-willed and light treatment of the blessing itself; and Luther laid the foundation of his social and domestic temple ominously. A zeal for Old Testament precedent might urge the punishment of death for violations of matrimonial law, but his legislation did not guard itself from within, and by its own spirit. He unsettled men's minds, and set them wandering. Invidious as the remark may seem, a loose, unguarded spirit lay underneath the Lutheran social and domestic type, ready to betray it and corrupt it as time ran on; and a too luxuriant fulness tended from the beginning to disease. The fault of his moral exemplar again appeared, only in another shape, in his theological; unguardedness in feeling, become irreverence in religion; and underneath the poetical and sympathetic character lurked the sceptical one, which rejected parts of Scripture. A natural melancholy completes the picture, and throws a dark shade over its luxuriance and glow.

Luther was a German. His character, combining warmth with looseness, and poetry with scepticism, betrays strongly the German type. With every natural gift and feeling in profusion, he wanted one quality, and that want is the want of moral and religious Germany at this day. Not chargeable, personally, with all the development of German feeling and intellect since his time, he nevertheless stands before us too clearly as the exemplar, which that development has carried out and expanded. Not the absolute originator of the German character, he is yet its striking and prophetic representative; the personifier of the nation. Luther himself half felt this position. It was his pride that he was a German, and he gloried in the conscious impulse he was giving to German intellect, character, and language. 'I was born for the good of my dear Germans,' he said, 'and I will never cease to serve them. 'The German language was superior to all others:' the Germans themselves 'were more honest, right, and true,' than all other people. 'We are all jolly 'fellows, we Germans; we eat, and drink, and sing, and break 'our glasses, and lose, at one sitting, an hundred or a thousand 'florins.' He knew the German character, and he sympathised with it in all its parts; he impersonated it with that truth and genuineness which sympathy supplies; and he has had that influence over it which a striking impersonation must have. Germany, in looking up to him, has always seen herself, and has been flattered and emboldened by the image. He has fixed national tendencies which might otherwise have wavered, and he has given consistency to impulses and direction to tastes. He has given her a great man, of whom she is proud; and all parts of the German mind exult in him. Students sing his songs at table, and congregations his hymns in church. Luther's Commentaries, and Luther's Table-talk, fasten on their respective disciples: and German piety, mirth, poetry, affection; German genius and industry; German enthusiasm and scepticism; German light-heartedness and melancholy, all see themselves reflected in their comprehensive prototype.

Another and still wider sphere of Luther's influence remains. Besides having an ἠθὸς, he had a dogma, and that dogma has covered a much larger ground than the national one of Germany.

When, in the commencement of this article, we gave an account of the formation and nature of the Lutheran dogma of justification by faith, we gave it in the full and extreme aspect of its formal and definite statement: we took Luther's own theological account of his own dogma. It was necessary to do this, because the formal account of a thing, if it is not itself the true and genuine one, is always suggestive, more or less, of that which is. It is always significant and speaking. But we are anxious now, before concluding, to exchange the more formal aspect of that dogma for a more practical one; though, in doing this, we are compelled, at the same time, to assign one great reason for it, which will, at first sight, look more severe than considerate. Formally and literally stated, then, the Lutheran dogma of justification by faith is so inconsistent with the first principles of common sense and natural religion, that, in this shape, no human being can possibly believe it. It requires us to believe that that which makes a man pleasing to God, or justifies him, has nothing to do with morality or goodness in him; and, being moral creatures, we cannot believe this. Luther himself could not believe it, or mean practically to teach it; and, therefore, the question remains,—What was the truth he practically taught?

What Luther practically taught, then, in the dogma of justification *without* works, seems to have been a particular view against formality, accuracy, and anxiety *in* works. It was a view antagonistic to an existing and authoritative one. He saw, he tells us, much narrow punctilious formalism in the lives and practice of Christians of his day; he had observed its effects upon the minds of many religious persons, monks, and others; and could testify that it debilitated and distorted, instead of strengthening and really disciplining, them. He speaks of death-beds he had seen, where the results of this system were most unfavourable; the fact being quite apparent that individuals had gained no real Christian principle or faith by it, whatever amount of self-denial they had in their own way undergone. Nor are we at liberty to deny all credit to such testimony. To such a narrowly scrupulous formal view of works, then, Luther opposed himself; but he opposed it in his usual extreme and extravagant way. Not content with correcting a narrow anxiety, he aimed at clearing away all anxiety whatever. He would fain have relieved absolutely the human mind of its burden, and divested the whole idea of duty of that salutary oppressiveness and fear which is essential to it.

The great cause of fear and anxiety in connexion with works is, the idea of their conditional place in the process of justification. A man who says to himself, I must perform such and such works, in order to stand well in God's sight, or be a justified person, is necessarily anxious and scrupulous about performing those works. On the contrary, if a man is justified, or is in God's favour without works, then whatever other place or subsequent importance may be assigned to works, he feels tolerably easy about them: the anxious point is passed, and he can afford to take his leisure. This was the arrangement, then, which the Lutheran dogma of justification made.[1] Not denying all place to good works, Luther deprived them of their conditional place; he took from them all contemporary action in the process of justification, and gave them a subsequent one. ‘I allow,’ he says, ‘that good works also are to be inculcated, but in their own time and place: that is to say, when we are out of this capital article of justification.’ ‘I, too, say, that faith without works is null and void;’ but not, he adds, ‘that faith has its solidity from its works, but only that it is adorned by them.’ *Christiani non fiunt justi operando justa, sed jam justificati operantur justa.* Wholly irrelevant to the understanding as may be the distinction here drawn between—the necessity of good works being acknowledged—their necessity prior to and subsequent to the act of justification; practically, we see a meaning and a difference. The one view practically attaches less anxiety to good works than the other does. It allows the mind, reposing upon a justification already past and complete, to proceed to good works as a sort of becoming and decorous appendage of that state. Thus set at ease, the Christian can, if he likes, fall back upon an easier and more casual and secular class of good works; and Luther advises him not to be spiritually ambitious. ‘There is no such great difference between a good Christian and a good citizen, in the matter of works. The works of the Christian are in appearance mean. He does his duty according to his calling; governs the state, rules his house, tills his field, does good to his neighbour.’[1] Such appears to be the practical upshot and meaning of Luther's dogma. Not absolutely denying the fundamental truth of natural religion, that man should do good works, the practical doctrine

---

[1] 'Hoc ideo curiosius observandum, ne errorem erremus, quem Lutherus, et post eum nostratium theologorum plerique, in disputationibus suis de justificatione contra pontificios, nimio contradicendi æstu abrepti, in ecclesias reformatas maximo earum malo invexerunt: sc. evangelium ex puris putis promissis constare; Christum dedisse mundo legem nullam; id tantum egisse, ut legem prius latam exponeret, atque a pessimis Scribarum ac Pharisæorum commentis assereret; legis moralis usum eum nunc esse unicum, ut per ipsam homines ad fidem Christi adducantur, *vel saltem ut sit arbitraria quædam vivendi regula, a Christo quidem nobis commendata, cui obtemperare ex gratitudine teneamur, nequaquam vero sub*

---

periculo animæ, aut tanquam conditio Novi Fœderis ad salutem observatu necessaria, nobis imposita. Ex his principiis, incautius ab iis positis, atque a theologorum vulgo avide arreptis, per necessariam consequentiam deducta fluxerunt execrabilia Antinomorum, Libertinorum, Familistarum atque ejusdem farinæ aliorum dogmata, de quibus fortasse boni illi viri ne per somnium quidem cogitarunt. Verum utut sit, qui talia docent et tamen in Libertinos magnis clamoribus vociferantur, quid aliud agunt, quam ut, dum illos damnant, seipsos condemnent? Quippe in præmissas consentiunt, conclusionem tantum respuunt. Ut huic pessimo errori obviam eatur, illud pro certo statuendum est, Christum in concione a Matthæo,' &c. &c.—*Bull, Harmonia Apostolica, Dissert. Prior*, p. 40.

[1] ‘Nec ita magnum est discrimen inter Christianum et hominem civiliter bonum. Nam opera Christiani in speciem vilia sunt. Facit officium juxta vocationem suam, gubernat rempublicam, regit domum, colit agrum, consulit, largitur, et servit proximo. Ea opera carnalis homo non magnifacit, sed putat esse vulgaria et nihili, quæ laici, imo gentiles, etiam faciant. Mundus enim non percipit ea quæ Spiritûs Dei sunt, ideo perverse judicat de operibus piorum. Monstrosam illam hypocritarum superstitionem, et eorum electitia opera, non solum admiratur, sed etiam religiose de eis sentit, et ea magnis impensis fovet. Contra piorum opera (in speciem quidem vilia et exilia tamen vero bona et accepta Deo cum fiant in fide, lætitia animi, obedientia, et gratitudine erga Deum) tantum abest ut agnoscat esse bona, ut etiam vituperet et damnet ea, tanquam summam impietatem et injustitiam.'—*Comment. in Gal. Opp.*, vol. v. p. 377.

makes the distinction between one class of works and another, and one mode of doing them and another.

This dogma of justification, then, has unquestionably had an important and influential career; and Luther has succeeded in impressing an idea very deeply and fixedly upon a theological posterity. It covers all Protestant Germany, Denmark, Sweden, and Norway; it has always had, and has now, a considerable reception within our own Church. Its effects are too apparent; and wherever the idea of works, as mere appendages to a state of justification, extends, it is seen to ease anxiety about them: a popular view of their practical unimportance arises, and displaces them as regular marks by which Christians are to be distinguished from the world. It is difficult to over-estimate the power of a dogma which brings to a point, and concentrates in one definite and portable distinction, a whole mass of vague thought and inclination, existing at large in human nature. With a basis of such a kind to support it, the pointed statement lays marvellous hold upon minds, penetrates them, and becomes their central informing principle. Our divines, as a body, have, indeed, done their duty with respect to this idea, and have exposed its one-sidedness and hollowness, its opposition to Scripture and to reason, and they have prevented English Lutheranism, or Calvinism, though it has gained extensive influence, from getting predominance. To one, more especially, the English Church owes her thanks, one whose exceeding clearness, vigour, and solidity, though running into occasional prolixity and minuteness, is well adapted to defend the truths of reason and Scripture. In the pages of Bishop Bull we are in a world of substance and reality, by the side of which the theology he was opposing appears like a dream. But the Lutheran dogma goes on, being the comfort and stay, the one Christian creed, the one religion of many minds. For the long continuance of such an idea it would be vain to attempt any philosophical account. We see the facts before us, and must be mainly content with them. It would be still more idle to prophecy than to explain. The Lutheran dogma, however, can only stand by the suppression of a large part of Scripture; and it seems reasonable to expect that any part of Scripture which is violently overborne must vindicate itself at last.

ART. V.—1. *The British Chaplaincy in Madeira. By* VISCOUNT CAMPDEN. *Reprinted, with additions, from 'The Theologian and Ecclesiastic,' for November,* 1847. London: W. J. Cleaver. 1847.

2. *A Brief Statement of Facts with regard to the British Chaplaincy at Madeira.* Funchal. 1846.

3. *Correspondence between the Lord Bishop of London, the Chaplain, and the Congregation of the British Church established in Madeira.* London: Hatchard. 1846.

4. *A Letter to R. Stoddart, Esq., Her Britannic Majesty's Consul at Madeira.* By S. CALVERLY BEWICKE, Esq. Funchal. 1846.

5. *Correspondence between the Rev. T. Salwey, of Oswestry, Salop, Her Britannic Majesty's Consul at Madeira, R. Stoddart, Esq., and the Rev. H. Landon.* Funchal. 1847.

THERE are few parts of the world in which the good and bad qualities of the English nation have been more curiously exemplified than in the Island of Madeira, to which we must for a short time call the attention of our readers. To begin with the favourable side; we consider it a high and peculiar distinction that it is not a British colony. For nearly 200 years, since the re-establishment of the independence of Portugal, the mother country has leaned upon British aid. During this whole period England has maintained her supremacy at sea. In a large part of it her peculiar craving seemed to be for the extension of her colonial and specially her insular empire. Yet while it would be difficult to estimate the expenditure which we have incurred in defence of Portugal, we believe that it has never been proposed that this island should be ceded as a very inadequate compensation. We do not think it would be easy to show an instance in the history of any other people of conduct so liberal and magnanimous towards a wholly helpless ally. We know from history what has been the usual result of alliance between the strong and the weak. Greek democracy, Roman aristocracy, French kingdom and empire, have exhibited them in turn. Here we see the peculiar honour of England. And it has been shown also in the high character and position of many of our principal merchants, whose houses of standing extending now beyond the memory of man, have made Funchal, in truth, a British factory, and exhibited British energy, perseverance, and integrity, in the most marked contrast to the failings of our faithful allies. So far well. Meanwhile, in this British factory, we find the English church so much a stranger that her House of Prayer was erected only in 1823. Until very lately we might have found the services of that Church so much corrupted, that an English Churchman could hardly have recognised the Church of his fathers. We find the British factory divided against itself into a number of sects, which as recapitulated by Lord Campden are really quite startling. As if to complete the miniature picture of English society, we find the epidemic ecclesiastical diseases of the day imported in their worst forms into the factory, and contending there with the Church of England, which seems also to have put on there her brightest apparel. We find the notorious Dr. Kalley boasting himself (with characteristic equivocation) 'a member of *the Churches of England*,' while in truth, he has been first, we believe, an independent, then a member of the Scotch establishment, and now of the Free Kirk (see Christian Remembrancer for April, 1846), harbouring himself under the insulted name of the Church of England while busy in making converts from the National Church to his own sect. Not to dwell on his disgraceful history, we have it followed up by the sad dissensions in the Church of England congregation of Funchal, to which we are now to call the attention of our readers, and in which the scenes which we have lately witnessed in England seem to have been caricatured; the supporters of the Church exhibiting an unusual degree of earnestness, moderation, respect for authority, firmness, and patience under outrage; while the assailants seem to have betrayed an unusual spirit of virulence, persecution, and unscrupulousness; and at the same time the British Government, we regret to say, has conducted itself as little to its credit, as in any instance with which we are acquainted.

Before detailing any particulars of the Madeira controversy, we must remind our readers of some circumstances in the position of the English Church abroad. We are not purposing to examine the state of things which warrants, because it compels, the formation of English churches in countries, where the Catholic Church is indeed in possession, but where her rulers refuse to admit English Churchmen to their communion except upon condition of renouncing obedience to the Church of England. This state of things we admit to be anomalous, and we can defend it only as a temporary expedient to meet a present need. While it lasts, however, it becomes us to be doubly careful that in exercising so extreme a right, and discharging functions so irregular, the Church of England shall never forget or conceal her true character and claims. This is the more necessary, because in most of those countries there are heretical sects, which falsely indeed, but pertinaciously, claim kindred with her, on the ground of a common protest against the Roman supremacy; and even where the whole native population is in external commerce with the Catholic Church (Greek or Roman), there are to be found English subjects members of the many sects which beset us at home, and who, being entitled to all the rights of Englishmen, are not unwilling to claim and assume, in that character, privileges which belong to us, not as Englishmen but as members of the Church.

Under such circumstances it becomes even more important in foreign countries than it is at home, that our administration of Church affairs should be in all respects regular and Catholic; that every officiating priest should feel himself, and be recognised by others (whether 'within' or 'without' the pale of the English Church), to be authorized not by himself, nor by his congregation, nor by the civil government, but by the Church and by the Bishop as her representative; that the services and rites of our common faith should be solemnized regularly, seriously, devoutly, and, therefore, in one word, according to the rules of the Church, not after the caprice of individuals.

The course actually adopted to secure these ends is as follows: British congregations abroad are to be distinguished into two classes, those which are established in factories where there is a resident consul, and which are recognised by the civil government; and those which exist in towns where the British residents, though often far more numerous, are mere sojourners without these advantages.

We shall not now enter at large into the latter case, to which, however, we have before this called attention, and shall probably take occasion to do so again. Few steps, we fear, have been taken to prevent abuses in the British congregations of such towns: at least we have yet to learn what they are. We believe the arrangements at present to be these, that any clergyman, or any other person not in orders, or not a member of the Church, is at full liberty to open a place of worship in any town where the English congregate, and give himself out as the representative of the Church of England—that (as there are many places where numbers of English reside, more or less permanently, without any chaplain at all) such a person, if he select his place judiciously, is pretty sure to obtain a congregation and something like a maintenance adequate or otherwise. It sometimes happens that an adventurer, ordained or not, is hired by some speculator (the practice is not limited to the tribe of Dan) to become his priest, when he is desirous to attract English visitors to some watering place; and in this case he becomes part of the staff in common with the keepers of the gambling tables, and the waiters at the 'tables d'hôte,' and the leaders of the band. In other instances men who have left England from necessity, or debt, or loss of character, or failure of health, have found congregations willing to assemble round them, and have officiated at their own risk. It follows that, as many of these accidents are common to the evil and the good, both extremes of character, and many of the intermediate shades, are to be found among our foreign chaplains. Nay, in one town we have known an exemplary clergyman to officiate for years, having been driven from England by failing health, and then an opposition Church was opened by an adventurer, who in that case, as it happened, ended his days as the object of the charity of the man to whom he would fain have been rival.

For all this there seems but one remedy, however difficult its application might be, at least in many instances. Those who officiate abroad ought to have some acknowledged and public credential from the Church at home. Without this no clergyman should be allowed to undertake pastoral care abroad, on pain of losing his privileges at home as a clergyman of the Church. The result would be, that no respectable person, really in holy orders, would be found willing to dispense with the proposed credential; and as soon as that end was attained the British residents abroad would feel, (what they cannot now feel, for it is not the case,) that the character of any man who attempted to officiate without it would not bear investigation.

To turn to the consular stations (of which Madeira is one), the case is different. The chaplains here are public functionaries nominated by the Crown, which contributes in part to their support, and holding a licence from the Bishop of London. And yet, even here, there is much to regret.

The Church affairs of these stations are regulated by an Act of Parliament, 6 Geo. IV. cap. 87, and by certain regulations issued by Lord Palmerston, as secretary of state, under the authority of that act, and with a view to its more efficient operation. It is provided that 'at any foreign port or place in 'which a chaplain is now, or shall at any future time be, resident, 'and regularly employed in the celebration of divine service, 'according to the rules and ceremonies of the United Church of 'England and Ireland, or of the Church of Scotland, and main'tained by voluntary subscriptions, &c.' the consul may be authorized by the secretary of state to contribute, at the expense of the Treasury, any such sums of money, not exceeding in any one year what has been raised by voluntary subscription, for the following purposes, or any of them—viz. (1) the maintenance of the chaplain; or (2) the expenses of divine service; or (3) maintaining burial grounds; or (4) towards interments of her Majesty's subjects therein; or (5) the erection of Church or Hospital, or the procuring of burial-ground. The consul is further required to call meetings twice in the year of all subscribers to these purposes, and the general meetings shall have power to make regulations, &c., which shall not, however, be valid without the sanction of the consul, and ultimately of the secretary of state. These regulations are to be 'such as may be necessary 'for carrying into execution the objects of this Act, so far as 'relates to these measures, or any of them.' The meeting is also to elect a treasurer and two trustees, but these last have no power to take any unusual step, make any regulation, &c., without authority from the general meeting. In the general meeting all British subjects are qualified to vote if they have subscribed in all 20*l.* to the purposes mentioned in the Act; so that they have contributed 3*l.* (whether as part of the original 20*l.* or not) within the last year. The treasurer may not refuse a subscription from any British subject who desires to qualify himself. 'All chaplains of the Church of England who 'are appointed under this Act are, at the request of the secre'tary of state, licensed by the Bishop of London, and are to 'consult the Bishop of London in all spiritual matters, and to 'obey his orders thereupon.' 'One chaplain only can be attached 'to each Church to which an allowance is granted,' and 'the Act 'of Parliament gives no power to the residents to interfere with 'the spiritual administration of the Church. This must be left to 'the chaplain. On the other hand the Act gives no power to the 'chaplain to interfere in the temporal administration of Church 'affairs. These matters must be left to the general meetings of 'the British residents.' 'Sacramental alms and oblations are 'to be distributed by the chaplain, and are not to be entered in 'the treasurer's account. The chaplain is nominated by her 'Majesty, through the secretary of state, and holds his office 'during her Majesty's pleasure, and no longer.'[1]

There are defects in this Act as interpreted by the regulations issued by Lord Palmerston, to which it will be necessary to call attention before we proceed to relate its practical administration in the Madeira case. It will be observed, that it is distinctly a Church Act; for although it includes other affairs than those strictly ecclesiastical (for example, the provision of hospitals for her Majesty's subjects), still it is so limited that it applies only to 'any foreign port or place in which a chaplain

---

[1] We believe this to be a fair abstract of the provisions. They are printed in the 'Brief Statement,' &c., pp. 7 to 17.

'is now or shall be resident.' Evidently it is, no chaplain no act, no regulation, no government allowance. If there were British residents, British consul, British burial-ground, British hospital, yet, without a resident chaplain, this act cannot be applied at all. This being the case, it is a glaring defect that the qualification for voting in the 'general meetings,' in which all the temporal affairs of the Church are to be settled, is merely one of money. Any man, be he bishop, priest, or deacon, churchman, or dissenter, or Roman Catholic, heretic, or Jew, or professed infidel, so that he have the pecuniary qualification, is equal in these meetings. Thus the whole temporal administration of the Church may be in the hands of unbaptized or excommunicate persons, and we shall see hereafter that this term 'temporal' is one capable of large application.

Again, although Lord Palmerston's 'regulations' say, that the chaplain is to be subject to the Bishop of London, this is not provided in the Act itself, which only prescribes his appointment by the Crown, and his tenure of office 'during pleasure, 'and no longer.' Thus the licence of the bishop may be set at nought, if such be the pleasure of any foreign secretary. A clergyman might legally be appointed whom the bishop refused to license, and one whom he highly approved, and whose licence he refused to revoke, might legally be displaced by the civil power. Be it here remembered that the foreign secretary need not be a member of the Church; and that Lord Aberdeen, Sir R. Peel's secretary (of whom we shall hear more before long), is actually a presbyterian. We understand that the English bishops refuse to license the chaplains of unions, because they are liable to be displaced, without their consent, by the Board of Guardians. The chaplains appointed under this act are in the same legal position—we say *legal,* because, in fact, no attempt has ever been made by any government to recall a chaplain who holds the bishop's licence, and (notwithstanding the evident hopes of the anti-church party in Madeira,) we cannot believe that any thing so indecent will be attempted. It is plain, however, that the law should be altered so far at least, that the whole administration of Church affairs may be in those who are really and *bonâ fide,* as well as in profession, members of the Church; and that the chaplain, once appointed, should be irremovable, except upon the revocation of his licence by the bishop. Other changes in the actual administration of things are no less necessary; but as we have no doubt that they result, not from faults in the law itself, but from the misinterpretation of it by the Foreign Office, we have not included them in this list. They will come before us in the sequel.

And now let Lord Campden relate the origin of the Church controversy in Madeira:—

'In 1833, Mr. Lowe was appointed to the chaplaincy by Lord Palmerston, at the unanimous request of the British residents in the island; Lord Palmerston having previously referred to the Bishop of London, and received most satisfactory statements from him respecting Mr. Lowe. The Bishop then gave Mr. Lowe his licence, in virtue of which Mr. Lowe has from that time officiated as chaplain. At the time of his appointment, the state of the English congregation at Madeira was at the lowest ebb: service was performed only once on Sunday, and then abbreviated and altered, in direct opposition to the order of the Church. Prayers were omitted, lessons altered, baptisms irregularly performed, the Holy Eucharist administered only four times a year, and even then no alms collected at the offertory. The catalogue of irregularities might easily be extended, but sufficient have been stated. Mr. Lowe commenced from the first gradually to bring the services up to the proper standard prescribed by order of the Church, till he had established a double daily service, weekly communions, offertorial collections on Sundays and other holy days, baptisms in the Church—restored all the omitted prayers, and a due observance of the great festivals and days appointed to be kept holy. In this salutary course he proceeded for eleven years uninterrupted, to the edification of his flock, and the manifest improvement of religion, and the state of morals and society among the English in the island. In 1844 commenced an unjustifiable opposition to him, which has been carried on up to the present time, and still continues with increasing bitterness and hatred. In the end of that year nine visitors to the island made a charge against his "teaching," and specified four objectionable sermons, three of which sermons half of the objectors had not heard—indeed it is believed they were not in the island when the sermons were preached! This charge was embodied in a memorial to the Bishop against Mr. Lowe. It was immediately met by a counter-memorial, made by nine other visitors to Madeira, vindicating the orthodoxy of the chaplain, and denying the preaching of any sermons contrary to the doctrine of the Church of England. The memorial and counter-memorial were forwarded to the Bishop of London, and copies also of the sermons in question were sent to him by Mr. Lowe. In due time an answer was received from the Bishop, stating that there was no doctrine put forth in any of the sermons which was at variance with the doctrine of the English Church, and expressing himself satisfied, from his knowledge of Mr. Lowe for several years past, that he "is justly entitled to their (the counter-memorialists) respect and affection." Here then was the first objection raised against Mr. Lowe, and deservedly did it meet with a signal failure. The unfortunate interference of nine discontented visitors, however, stirred up a flame most difficult to be quenched. Had it not been for this unhappy circumstance, matters would in all probability have gone on quietly as usual, as they had been going on for the past eleven years, and the peace of the Church there would have remained undisturbed; to these nine, then, primarily belongs the responsibility of all the sad scenes, heart-burnings, and contentions that have followed.

'In the spring of 1845, twenty-nine of the permanent residents, incited thereto by what has just been stated, made a request to Mr. Lowe to return to the same manner of performing Divine Service as when he first undertook the duty. To this he replied in an able and temperate letter, stating the reasons why it was impossible for him to do so, saying that he was bound to obey the orders of the Church, and that the only way to avoid any irregularity in the service was to regulate it according to the directions of the Rubrics, which afforded an invariable rule to follow, and to obey which he was solemnly obliged by his ordination vows, and to the following of which rule he had adhered for many years without any expressed dissatisfaction on the part of his congregation. This did not satisfy them, and the treasurer and two trustees of the chapel proceeded, as they profess, in the name of those who made the application (although no authority has ever been shown which gave them this power; and it is remarkable, that more than one of the applicants withdrew from all further proceedings, being convinced of their unfairness), to address the Bishop of London, specifying nine points of complaint against Mr. Lowe for his method of performing Divine Service, and otherwise entering into incorrect charges against him.'

This letter having been communicated to Mr. Lowe, was received by him with so much gentleness, that he even told the writers that he thought six of the points mentioned 'might easily be arranged,' if they would yield their objections on three, which he felt he could not conscientiously give up.

This offer being refused by the complainants, their letter went, and in due course his lordship's reply arrived. With admirable patience he discusses the complaints—some false, some frivolous, some against practices in adopting which Mr. Lowe had evidently no alternative, and at last he leaves Mr. Lowe at liberty to concede to them these four points:—

'1. Preaching in the surplice.
'2. Singing the Communion Hymns.
'3. Reading every Sunday the Exhortation.
'4. Walking at funerals from the church to the burial-ground in the surplice.' (Cor. p. 42.)

'thus showing his promptitude and willingness to gratify them, 'to the furthest limit of allowed concession.'—*Lord Campden*, p. 11.

So grave were the questions for which the British Church in Madeira was to be thrown into flames! The Bishop remarks:

'These are all the charges of which complaint is made, and I have now considered them one by one. I am extremely sorry that differences should have arisen between Mr. Lowe and any portion of his congregation, on matters, some of which are confessedly of trifling importance *in themselves*, but which Mr. Lowe considers to involve the principle of obedience to rules, which he has solemnly promised to observe.

'Whatever practice is not enjoined by these rules, or sanctioned by general custom, I advise him to lay aside, if by so doing he can satisfy the scruples of those persons who are really members of our Church; but I cannot, with any consistency, urge him to disregard those rules where they are plain and positive; although I might not think it necessary to press compliance with them in those instances where the non-observance of them has received a certain degree of sanction from general and long-prevailing custom, acquiesced in by the rulers of the Church.

'Those persons who desire to have the advantage of the services of the Church in all their completeness, according to the Church's express directions, would have reason to complain if they were curtailed or altered; and it appears there are many such persons in Mr. Lowe's congregation; and when a question arises, whether he shall comply with the wishes of those who would have him *disobey* the Church's rules (which he has promised to observe), or of those who desire that he should *follow* them, it seems but reasonable that he should incline to the latter rather than to the former; and it would be manifestly wrong in me, whose duty it is to take care that these rules are observed, to urge upon him an opposite course of proceeding.

'I have only to add an expression of my earnest hope that Mr. Lowe will perform (as I have reason to believe he *does* perform) all his ministrations with meekness and charity, as well as with punctuality and correctness, and that his congregation will receive them in the same spirit.'—*Correspondence*, &c. pp. 36-40.

The points on which the Bishop refused to permit the faithful members of the Church to be sacrificed to the agitators, were the use of the Prayer for the Church Militant, and the weekly offertory. As far as we can see, these points form the pretext, not of course the real cause, of all the subsequent agitation. But the Bishop's answer contained other remarks which were naturally galling to the complainants; he administered, says Lord Campden 'a severe rebuke to those who, upon their own 'showing, had ceased to attend the English chapel, and repaired 'to a Dissenting meeting-house, because they disapproved of 'Mr. Lowe. He said, "that those persons who have resorted 'to this extreme measure, without waiting to learn the result 'of an appeal to me, can hardly claim to be heard as members of 'our Church, on the subject of the present complaint."'—(p. 7.)

The next step of the complainants was, that of succeeding in obtaining a majority of votes in the general meeting, the function of which is strictly limited to the 'temporal affairs of the Church.' They explained these by refusing to allow any salary to be paid, either to the chaplain, organist, doorkeeper, or pew-opener. Having voted this by a tyrant majority, one of them boasted, 'well, at all events, we have got rid of Mr. Lowe.' But behold the chaplain refused to resign, and the Churchmen in Madeira subscribed, in a few days, £300, which was paid to him instead of the £200 refused by the meeting. But the chaplain has been the sufferer by this exchange, for whereas, the secretary of state through the consul, had hitherto allowed a sum equal to that voted by the meeting, Lord Aberdeen, and subsequently Lord Palmerston, have refused to pay anything, although there is still a chaplain, and he is still maintained by voluntary contributions of Churchmen.

Meanwhile it seemed clear that any Churchman had a right to require the elected treasurer to receive his subscription for any one of the purposes mentioned in the Act, and therefore subscriptions were tendered to him 'for the payment of the chaplain.' These he refused, being a strong partizan of the complainants, on the pretext that the meeting had decided that no payment should be made to the chaplain, and in this palpably illegal refusal he was supported by the consul and the secretary of state.

Time passed on however, and the usual meeting again took place in January, 1847. There was an evident objection to Churchmen qualifying themselves to vote at this meeting, for if the salary were successfully refused, they must still support their chaplain; while, on the other hand, if the complainants increased their strength by qualifying new members, and succeeded in refusing it, the money subscribed was still to be disposed by their own votes; and when they had (as they hoped) got rid of their present pastor, the accumulation would only remain in hand to supply future years, and prevent the necessity of their subscribing again. Besides this, the opponents of the Church had another great advantage. In order to qualify any British subject to vote, his subscription must be paid to the Treasurer. Now the treasurer was the creature and nominee of the complainants. It was therefore perfectly well known to the opponents of the Church how many voters were qualified to vote in defence of the Church, but the Churchmen knew nothing of the strength of their adversaries until they met in the Consular residence. They came sanguine of success, for they were, notwithstanding all difficulties, twenty in number, and the majority of the year before was only thirteen in all (See 'Brief Statement,' page 5). To their astonishment, however, they found the room thronged with thirty-five voters, seventeen of whom at least must have qualified themselves, at the expense of 20*l.* each, for the express purpose of attending to vote against any application of the money subscribed for the maintenance of the British Church in Madeira, whether by themselves or their opponents. Lord Campden says:—

> 'And this (it is currently believed) by the aid of money obtained out of the island: persons well acquainted with the opponents considering that none of them were in such a position as to be able to provide the sum of £300[1] which was expended in qualifying them as voters."—P. 16.

Again, therefore, the payment of the chaplain and the necessary expenses of the church were refused, and to make this refusal more marked, the majority proceeded to vote a salary to a gardener for keeping the grounds round the church in order.

But all this would not remove Mr. Lowe, who held his office by the appointment of the Crown and the licence of the Bishop, although the meeting at the consul's house, and the foreign secretary had combined to deprive him of his salary.

---

[1] Is it possible that this money was really paid, or was there any collusion between the voters and the treasurer?

The malcontents, therefore, tried another plan to effect their object. They held another meeting in May last, at which they addressed Her Majesty, 'to remove the cause of the dissatisfaction,' to remove the chaplain for not disobeying the orders of the Bishop of London, to which (to speak of no higher obligation), he was bound to render obedience, by the express orders of Her Majesty's secretary of state, under which he was nominated to the chaplaincy. When this request was made, it is to be observed, that the chaplain held his office both by appointment from the Crown and by licence from the Bishop, and that no charge of any kind had ever been brought against him, except those addressed to the Bishop of London, and answered, as we have seen. The meetings which refused his salary, had, in each instance, refused to assign any reason for doing so. Their motive was obvious; for the meeting has no spiritual authority by the very regulations of Lord Palmerston himself, and the only pretext for these measures was, that Mr. Lowe had taken his directions, in matters purely spiritual, from the Bishop of London, not from the majority of the meeting.

What answer then was returned by the Government of England, to such a request from such parties? Did it receive any? Yes, strange to say, it was noticed. Then our readers will say, the secretary of state reproved those who ventured upon so immodest a request. Guess again. He replied, perhaps, that the Bishop had seen reason to withdraw Mr. Lowe's licence, and that Her Majesty had, therefore, recalled her appointment. That answer would have justified Lord Palmerston, no doubt, at the expense of the Bishop; but, alas, it could not be given. The licence stands good. Is it possible that Lord Palmerston displaced the chaplain in defiance of the Bishop? He did more, he defied the Bishop and the Queen, Church and State both. He wrote to the meeting, 'to elect a successor to Mr. Lowe'—the appointment of the Crown, and the licence of the Bishop remaining in force; and the appointment, even if the chaplaincy were vacant, being vested not in the meeting of subscribers, but in the Queen. Lord Campden proceeds:—

> 'As if to extend these insults to the Church at large, this act is still further perpetrated without any previous communication with the Bishop of London, by virtue of whose licence Mr. Lowe continues, un-recalled, to exercise his duties as chaplain! without the slightest intimation given beforehand to the Bishop or Mr. Lowe! And the first knowledge that the Churchmen have of it is at a meeting called in the beginning of May last, when the dispatch was read ordering this shameful proceeding—a dispatch which had been made known to many of the opposition, but up to the time of the meeting carefully concealed from the Churchmen! To

suppose for a moment that the Foreign Office would ever have made such an egregious mistake, or offered such a deliberate insult to the Church, is beyond all belief.

'We understand, that as soon as the knowledge of this extraordinary proceeding came to the ears of the Bishop, his Lordship was naturally very much surprised and annoyed, and protested to Lord Palmerston against it in the strongest manner—it was hoped with good effect, as Lord Palmerston was understood to have acknowledged that he could not decently appoint another chaplain, while the actual chaplain retained the Bishop's licence; and the Bishop, as was to be supposed, will not withdraw the licence, as he sees no ground whatever for doing so, and considers Mr. Lowe to have been cruelly ill-used and persecuted. Thus stands the matter at present. The Foreign Office has used tyranny worse than ever any Pope did, and its fiat has gone forth to appoint another chaplain. Meanwhile Mr. Lowe will not resign; he could not do so without yielding to the supremacy of the Foreign Office, and sacrificing all the great principles for which he has during the last three years been so nobly contending; and the Bishop does not withdraw his licence, but protests to the Government against such unbecoming proceedings on the part of the holders of power. May God defend the right. But Churchmen must be active, they must not slumber, they must be up and doing; they must give every support they can to this cause, which is the cause of the Church against tyranny; and justice may yet be obtained, and a victory won for the Church over her unscrupulous foes.

'The noble champion of this cause, the faithful Pastor of the English congregation in Madeira, must not be forgotten. He is fighting a glorious fight; and we trust, will meet with a due reward. He has sacrificed his personal comforts and convenience to his duty to the Church, his Bishop, and his flock. He remains in Madeira, to uphold the authority of the Bishop, the independence of Foreign Chaplains, the privileges of his faithful flock; and shall he be left unsupported? No! his cause is the cause of the Church at large; the principles of ecclesiastical discipline, and obedience to spiritual authority are at stake, and we do not doubt for a moment that all Churchmen in England will join in doing everything in their power, to support their Bishop in his lawful authority against the oppression of the State, to maintain in every way their good English chaplain in Madeira, and to vindicate the rightful and precious privileges of their brother Churchmen in that distant island.

'P.S.—Since the publication of this paper in the "Theologian and Ecclesiastic" of November, further accounts have been received of the continual aggressive proceedings of the malcontents. The consul had been absent in England a great part of the summer and autumn, during which time the faction remained quiescent; but immediately upon his return to Madeira, in the beginning of November, he is understood to have held a consultation with the treasurer and trustees, the result of which was that these persons requested a meeting to be summoned, at which they proceeded to resolve, that as they had received no further communication from Lord Palmerston, they would proceed to the further consideration of his Lordship's dispatch of April last, and recommend the Rev. Thomas Kenworthy Brown, Vicar of Easeby, to be appointed chaplain! An amendment was moved, very properly stating that such an act would be a transgression of the Act of Parliament, which vested the appointment solely in the hands of the Sovereign, through one of the secretaries of state; and, also, that in the present instance the chaplaincy was not vacant, but held by Mr. Lowe, against whom there were not, nor could be, any charges preferred. Of course the tyrant faction, having a majority *in the meeting* (that they are a small minority *out of it* everybody knows), carried their resolution. It was, however, considered by well-judging persons to be only a desperate move on their part to retrieve the mistake they fell into at the meeting on the 6th of May, and a strong letter to the Bishop of London, condemning this resolution and the proceedings of the meeting, was immediately written, and signed by seventy-one communicants,—the number of communicants at Church just at that time being about seventy-eight. We grieve to say that much less decorum than usual was exhibited at this meeting, and that most unbecoming language was used against Mr. Lowe, and also against a *Clergyman* and *four ladies* present, to the great satisfaction of the majority;—and this was permitted, unchecked, it is feared, by the chairman. Sad, indeed, is the spectacle afforded by some of our fellow-countrymen abroad.

'It is worthy of serious attention, that Mr. Brown, recommended by the malcontents, as the person to be hereafter exposed to the treatment always experienced by his predecessors, is almost unknown to them: to the minority, indeed, he was unknown, it is believed, even by name, till he was proposed at the meeting. But it is well understood that he was recommended to the malcontents by a clergyman, who had made secret accusations to the Bishop of London against Mr. Lowe,—from which accusations, however, Mr. Lowe triumphantly vindicated himself.

'It can scarcely be supposed that Mr. Brown is cognizant of the true state of things, or he would surely hesitate before he commits himself to the false position of being the nominee of a party, and of endeavouring to supplant a brother clergyman in the allotted sphere of duty; neither can it be conceived that Mr. Brown would venture to go out to officiate without a licence from the Bishop, which he must be well aware he cannot obtain, the present chaplain being in possession of the Bishop of London's licence, by virtue of which he officiates as English Chaplain to Madeira, and for the withdrawal of which his lordship has stated that no grounds exist.

'It remains to be seen what notice this last resolution of the meeting will meet with at the Foreign Office, whether the feelings of the majority of the congregation, and the members of the Church will still be disregarded; and we trust that the propriety will be obvious of attending to the remonstrances of the Lord Bishop of London, who is, by Lord Palmerston's own regulations, as well as by his episcopal office, the appointed judge in these matters, and to whose advice in the appointment of foreign chaplains, it is the custom of the Governments to look and defer.'—Pp. 20—23.

We have carried on the narrative to the present moment, that the course of events might be more clear, but we must now mention several important circumstances in explanation, which we have hitherto omitted.

It would be a great error to suppose this to be a contest between a clergyman and his flock; such a thing may sometimes occur without blame to the pastor, but Mr. Lowe's trial, though severe, is of a much less painful kind. It is not a contest within the Church, but a persecution from without. Nothing is more impressed upon us in reading the narrative at the head of this article. The original complaint of December, 1844, which stirred up this strife, originated with a few (nine) strangers; may they consider how they can answer to the Church and to God for the results of their step. With regard to the next complaint of the twenty-nine residents in the spring of 1845, Mr. Bewicke it seems informed the Bishop of London that the 'majority were dissenters.' This statement having been assailed, he replies:

> 'If I have misrepresented them I am sorry for it. Eleven of them held seats in their own names at another place of worship in the year 1845; others were either avowedly not members of the Church of England, (Correspondence, 66—71,) or so generally known as non-attendants at its services as to induce me in common charity to believe that they were attendants at some other place of worship. I was singularly unfortunate in the result of my inquiries at the time, if the majority of the twenty-nine complainants did not attend on a dissenting ministry.'—P. 4.

Lord Campden remarks that the complainants themselves, having occasion to speak to the Bishop of London, of the Church of England, call it neither *the Church*, nor even by a phrase common rather than reverend, *our Church*, but YOUR CHURCH, (See Correspondence, p. 51). The same gentlemen, as is also noticed by Lord Campden, complain of the custom of singing instead of reading the seraphic hymn in the Communion Service. Now we can imagine good Churchmen, who were, unfortunately, without taste for Church music, and as yet unaccustomed to it, annoyed at this practice; but it is certainly impossible that any one such individual should fail to know something of the words with which that glorious hymn is introduced in our Prayer Book. Alas for the complainants! —they send deliberately over some thousands of miles of salt water, a complaint to the Bishop that they are not allowed to say—'THEN with Angels and Archangels.' Could this mistake have been made by any one who had, even once, repeated the words?

To turn from these internal evidences—we find great complaints indeed of the Offertory; but, as the complaints proceed, the collections go on increasing. Lord Campden writes:—

> 'The Services and the weekly Communions were fully and satisfactorily attended, and, notwithstanding that the chapel only accommodates between four and five hundred persons, and that the influx of visitors of 1846 was very considerably less than in the previous year, and that during four or five months of summer and autumn the congregation is very small; upwards of £300 was collected during the year at the Offertory, being a larger amount than it had ever previously attained. This is a most gratifying circumstance, and a decisive proof of the genuine faith and piety of the great majority of the congregation.'—P. 15.

So strictly is it a persecution from without; neither is this persecution of a very scrupulous kind; for example:—

> 'An unworthy manœuvre has been practised to give a deserted appearance to the chapel. Many pews are hired, and locked up, by the mal-

contents, although every other seat in the chapel is filled, and many visitors are thus unable to procure sittings. One lady with a large family has been, during her temporary absence in England, deprived of those she has occupied for some years, although it was known that she wished to retain them: and she with her family are now left without seats. Another proof is thus added to the already numerous ones of the unscrupulous proceedings of the anti-Church party.'—*Lord Oampden*, p. 23.

Such has been the case throughout; it has been the anti-Church party against the chaplain and congregation. There was no fear of a 'secessio plebis;' if the opposing party had all seceded, they would have left behind them not solitude but only peace. Much less would the religious character or respectability of the congregation have suffered. At the great meeting of January, 1847, in which the malcontents amounted to thirty-six, they numbered only five communicants, the minority of twenty being communicants without a single exception. But this was not all. The leader of the majority on that day was a professed Socinian, and the supporters of the Church could not but feel that they gained by the fact, for he was infinitely superior in propriety of behaviour to many of those who, because they belonged to no other religious society, called themselves, by courtesy, Churchmen. We have seen that the letter to the Bishop of London, condemning the last step of the majority in the pretended election of Mr. Brown, has just been signed by seventy-one communicants out of seventy-eight.[1]

But if there are few communicants among the majority, there are abundance of other elements of strength, which are quite wanting among the supporters of the chaplain; of the thirty-six, Lord Campden (who was present,) writes: 'Most 'were Dissenters of various denominations, Socinians, Presby- 'terians, Wesleyans, &c.; others, infidels, profligates, bank- 'rupts (formerly outlawed,) &c.; and some professing members 'of the Church, who never attend service, others who attend 'but rarely.'—P. 16.

The consul, indeed, ruled every point as was desired by the opponents of the Church, even rejecting, at the vote of the majority, two protests tendered by the Church party, although he had expressed his own opinion that, according to precedent, a protest should be entered on the minutes. But then the consul is a Presbyterian. The secretary of state (Lord Aberdeen) approved of the proceedings of the consul and his majority, but then his Lordship belongs to the same sect. It must be admitted that, for whatever reason, the Churchmen of Madeira and their chaplain have not, to use a common phrase, 'Christians of all 'denominations,' on their side. This may however be boasted by the complainants. For one of those who came before the Bishop of London to complain of practices, which though innocent in themselves, yet shocked their weak nerves, especially in these critical times, by their frightful proximity to the practices of the Roman Church—one of these pure and zealous Protestants, who has pursued Mr. Lowe through every meeting of the Church Committee, and every appeal to the Foreign Office and the press—belonged (will our readers believe it?) to the Church of Rome. It hardly seems to have been an idle vaunt of the Irish Reformation Society orator, who declared he would go to Rome, and make the Pope himself cry 'No Popery.'

---

[1] The number at that moment; it is often much greater, but of course varies considerably, with the increase or diminution of the number of strangers in the island.

From such a body it is not wonderful that the theology of the English Church obtains small favour. But the clerical members of the party at least should learn prudence from the unhappy fate of poor Mr. Salwey—we beg his pardon, 'The Rev. T. Salwey, of Oswestry, Salop;' this gentleman, it seems, heard doctrines in Mr. Lowe's preaching so shocking, that he felt it his duty to write to the foreign secretary requesting that his name might be withdrawn from the protest sent to him against the proceedings of the assailants. For the same reason it seems that he supplied to the Presbyterian consul, a copy of a private letter addressed to him by a brother clergyman to dissuade him from that step, and which expressed a low estimate of the theological qualifications of the malcontent party. The letter thus supplied to the consul was soon published by the malcontents, and this led to a pamphlet, named at the head of our article, 'Correspondence between the Rev. T. Salwey, &c.,' in which the consul, who is most anxious to appear neuter, certainly does not shine. But our present affair is with Mr. Salwey, he seems to have been impelled to these somewhat unusual steps by the horror with which he regarded Mr. Lowe's doctrines, which was so strong as to lead him even to write to Lord Aberdeen that he 'differed conscientiously from the chaplain in his religious views.' When these expressions were published, Mr. Lowe requested an explanation, and was assured that they referred not to any vague reports, but only to the statements which he had himself heard him make from the pulpit. The reply is too good not to be laid before our readers:—

'Madeira, June 14, 1847.

'Dear Sir,—I am much obliged for the kind explanation you have sent me of your meaning in attributing to me 'peculiar views' at variance with your own; for you appear to have intended no reproach by this expression. At the same time, considering that such difference seems not only to have influenced you in desiring to erase your signature from a paper to which you had affixed it, but to have possessed sufficient consequence to be brought forward publicly before the Earl of Aberdeen in his official capacity, in justification of requesting the withdrawal of your signature, I am afraid that any third person will still expect some more complete explanation of the real state or merits of the case than you have afforded, or had it in your power to afford.

'I would not be supposed to seek to draw the bonds of agreement in matters of opinion closer than the Church has drawn them; but it is a question which may still, I fear, be thought not fully settled by your letter. Are not your expressions, coupled with actions so remarkable, calculated to convey to most minds an idea of peculiarity of views in points of doctrine beyond such allowed or authorized limits?

'It is therefore most satisfactory to have your declaration that 'what you meant by my peculiar views is simply what you heard me preach;' and, again, that 'you only know my views by my preaching;' for this enables me to satisfy yourself and all men, not only that such peculiarity is really, as your letter intimates, and so far as I am concerned, irrespective of all points of established faith or doctrine, but also that it exists, after all, rather on your side than on mine.

'Before your letter reached me I feared you had been led into misapprehension by some false report or exaggeration, which it might have been as unpleasant to trace to its originators as difficult to refute. I am the more thankful, therefore, to find that the matter rests on ground so narrow, clear, and easy to approach.

'Previous to your arrival, impressed by local circumstances strongly with the importance of avoiding all pretext for agitation or excitement in this place, I resolved for a season to have recourse to the works of some popular and well-known standard writer in our Church, of an age and stamp at once removed from all suspicion of connexion with the controversies of the present day, and of authority above cavil or impeachment. Such an author and divine was Bishop Beveridge, who had the further recommendation of being also a well-known powerful opponent of all Romanizing views and doctrines, and of being held in special favour by the extreme Puritan, or so-called Evangelical party, in our Church.

'In proof of the reasonableness, or, indeed, the necessity, of my seeking some such safeguard against ignorance and prejudice, you will doubtless smile to hear that I was gravely charged, the very winter you were in Madeira, by a clergyman considered to be of that party, with preaching, in two sermons[1]

* • • * • * *

those two very sermons being actually Bishop Beveridge's!

'I cannot, therefore, but rejoice again to claim the shelter of a name so venerable, for any supposed peculiarity of views attributed to me more generally by yourself. For it is certain that for every one of the sermons preached by me during your stay in Madeira, and on which your charge against me rests, Bishop Beveridge is entirely responsible. All the sermons which you heard me preach were not mine, but his. What you dissented from were *his* views, *his* words, and not peculiarly mine.

'Instead, therefore, of fixing upon me any personal peculiarity of views, your allegation resolves itself into a statement of a difference of views between yourself and Bishop Beveridge, upon which I need not enter; for

---

[1] Mr. Lowe has omitted a passage here, as it was taken from a private letter of this clergyman; but, as the story is current in Madeira, we may as well state that the charge was, that the two sermons contained 'views' different from those of the venerable Beveridge.—*Lord Campden*, p. 24.

I heartily respond to your apparent inclination to avoid all unnecessary extension of this correspondence.

'I remain therefore,
'Dear Sir, yours very truly,
The Rev. T. Salwey. '(Signed) R. T. LOWE.'

It would seem that the course taken by the majority has as little support in the law of England as in the eternal principles of truth, and justice, and charity; the consul, indeed, and the secretary of state have hitherto supported their line against chaplain, bishop, and law. But common sense reclaims against these proceedings, and the law it seems speaks the same language:—

> 'A legal opinion was subsequently obtained as to the illegality of these resolutions, the opinion of an eminent counsel being that the meeting was constituted for the purpose of *carrying into execution* the objects of the Act regulating the affairs of British Churches abroad, and therefore not justified in withholding the chaplain's salary, such an act being in direct contravention of the law which provides for—1. The proper support of the chaplain—2. The due and proper maintenance of Divine Service—3. The expenses of the burial-ground—4. The interment of British subjects. Now, if the meeting have power to render null one portion of the Act, they have power to render null any other portion,—for instance, to forbid the interment of British subjects—which is manifestly absurd. The meeting have therefore no right to act as they do, in opposition to the Act of Parliament; and Lords Aberdeen and Palmerston are open to the charge of acting illegally in sanctioning the resolutions of the meeting.'—*Lord Campden*, p. 13.

The question seems exactly similar to that lately decided in England, by which it was settled that vestries cannot refuse to make necessary rates for the repair of the parish church; the vestry being a body legally constituted to carry the law into effect, not to defeat its provisions. So clearly does this case come under the principle of that decision, that the meeting itself could not exist if there was no chaplain. It is only in ports and places where there is a chaplain supported, &c., that the Act can be put in force at all. It would seem then that if the minority had not continued to contribute to the support of Mr. Lowe, the majority would have lost their right to meet and vote under the Act. But if Mr. Lowe is still chaplain, and is supported, as we have seen, by voluntary subscriptions, then there is no pretence for the wrong which the Foreign Office has committed in refusing the usual assistance towards his maintenance.

Still more evidently illegal was the other decision of the consul and the secretary of state, that the treasurer was justified in refusing subscriptions offered for the support of the chaplain, because the meeting had decided against allowing him any salary. Our readers will find in page 15 of Lord Campden's pamphlet, that eminent legal opinions have been given upon this point. But indeed no opinion was needed: for when the Act expressly allows subscriptions for the purposes mentioned, *or any of them*, nothing but the extreme of prejudice could lead to the opinion that the treasurer could refuse to receive them for one of these purposes, because it chanced to be distasteful to the majority of the last 'general meeting.'

To hasten over this part of the subject, if the majority of a meeting be allowed to act as the Madeira meeting has hitherto acted, it is no longer true that the chaplain holds his office during her Majesty's pleasure. The majority of a general meeting may prevent his receiving the allowance given by her Majesty herself, even although the whole body of the communicants and of the congregation highly prize his services, and although nine-tenths of the subscribers are of the same opinion. A very small proportion only of the subscribers can have votes in the general meeting, and none of the poorer classes, so that the bounty of the Crown, the wishes of the congregation, and the intention of the subscribers, may alike be frustrated by the perverseness of two or three subscribers who may be members of the general meeting, on a mere money qualification, without being members of the English Church at all. It is vain to say that no spiritual authority is entrusted to this general meeting, if its members are allowed, as in the present instance, on grounds purely spiritual, not only to withhold from the chaplain their own subscriptions, but to prevent his receiving the allowance given by the Crown, and thus, perhaps, (in many instances, if not in this,) to enforce his resignation.

We have shown, we think, that the Act of Parliament itself is radically unjust and indefensible, because it entrusts the management of Church affairs to a body, all of whom may be, and many actually are, aliens from the Church; and because it fails to secure to the foreign chaplains that independence which it is the character of our Church to give to every incumbent, and in a great degree to every curate. It leaves them removable by the Crown, although still holding the unrevoked licence of the diocesan. This is so contrary to all Church principles as to be incapable of defence even for a moment; and thus far the law clearly needs amendment. Next, we have seen, that as it has been actually administered by the Foreign Office, it has been stretched against its evident meaning, so as to give to a tyrant majority power, even in matters spiritual, over chaplain, bishop, and Crown itself, even though that majority be altogether composed of Dissenters. It seems to follow, clearly, that some alteration of the law is immediately necessary, which shall prevent any persons, not *bonâ fide* Churchmen, from interfering with the affairs of the Church; shall secure to the chaplains, once appointed, the independence of their office by making them irremovable except by the revocation of their licence,[1] and which shall declare for all future time the illegality of any vote on the part of the general meeting, by which the salary of the chaplain shall be stopped, or the offerings of any Churchman for his support refused. Let it be observed, we allow every one free liberty to subscribe or not as he pleases, we only refuse him (what we are sure the existing laws already refuse) the power of subscribing to the fund raised for the support of the chaplain, in order that he may be qualified to divert from his support both his own subscription and that of others.

But Churchmen in England must be alert in defence of their brethren in Madeira; 'If one member suffer, all the members suffer with it;'—the independence of the Church at home is compromised, if outrages such as those which it has been our duty to detail, are permitted to pass unchecked abroad. It is to the Church at home that the Churchmen of Madeira are looking for sympathy, nay, for common justice. From the Foreign Office, they have but too clearly learned, they must expect neither one or the other. This may be clear to our readers from the facts we have already stated, but we have not yet mentioned the worst and meanest. Mr. Lowe's salary for the year 1845 was voted by the general meeting, and paid by the treasurer; yet (if we are not misinformed) the half due to him from the Treasury for that year has been stopped, as well as for those years in which the meeting has refused their contribution. If this is, as we fear, correct, it is indeed deeply disgraceful to the administration of the Foreign Office.

But the Churchmen of Madeira will not call in vain upon their brethren at home. If they are unrepresented in the British Parliament, we are not, and we cannot for shame leave the government of England to perpetrate wrongs like these. If, any where in the wide circle of the globe, there be a portion of the Anglican Church which justly claims our sympathy and regard, that portion is the English factory of Madeira. Look to either of its constituent parts, the residents and the visitors, and say where shall we find men more worthy of our highest consideration.

---

[1] This cannot be any infringement of those rights of the Crown of which the modern Whigs are so laudably jealous; for at this moment every holder of a Crown living, of a bishopric or a deanery, is in the same predicament; appointed by the Crown, but holding his office, not during pleasure, but during good behaviour. It was the boast of the reign of George III. that the judges were then put upon this footing; let the rendering the same justice to the foreign Chaplains be an ornament of the reign of his grand-daughter. Eminently does justice demand this when the Foreign Secretary may be, nay, so lately has been, a member of a hostile sect, and when, for all we know, he may soon be a Jew. It is plainly monstrous, that clergymen holding the licence of the Bishop, should be removable by such an authority. Meanwhile, if the Foreign Office makes a point of retaining the power of stopping at any time the government allowance, let it be so; we will not contend about money, but let not the spiritual office—the pastoral relation—depend on the will of secular authorities who may often not even be Churchmen.

Among the residents who have stood firm to the Church and their pastor are found the names of all the principal British merchants of Funchal, whose integrity, whose honour, whose hospitality, have for so many years adorned the English name. There are among those who have remained faithful,—we speak from personal knowledge, and an intimate acquaintance with their way of life during a protracted stay in England,—men whom it is a credit to the English Church to have brought up and to have retained under such auspices as those which preceded Mr. Lowe's appointment; whose dignified and serene consistency in practical works, whose conduct of their families, whose deep and regular appreciation of the means of grace, whose acquaintance with the principles of our Church, and whose whole life and conversation place them on the same standard with the very choicest of the English laity? Shall they be given up, bound, as we may say, hand and foot, into the power of the unhappy clique of all denominations which has accidentally obtained a majority in the parliamentary general meeting?—forbid it, justice—forbid it, shame. These men are they who built the English Church at Madeira, before the Act of Parliament, which is now used for their oppression, had been framed—before any allowance had been made by government, they supported the incumbent of that Church so liberally that his income (as Lord Campden observes) was larger when they supplied the whole than it has been since the Treasury has contributed half. Repeal the act, if you will—take away the aid of government if you think it can be done decently; but free the British merchants of Madeira from the odious tyranny which, under cover of that act, is now imposed upon them. Let them and their children enjoy the ministrations of that Church which they have founded and maintained, and which they so highly value.

Surely it were preposterous to suppose that even a temporary and ignominious peace could be purchased by the sacrifice of Mr. Lowe to his assailants. Should the Foreign Office be so ill advised as to throw itself openly into the arms of that faction, it has, indeed, power, under the present unecclesiastical law, to deprive Mr. Lowe of his post, in open insult to the authority of the Bishop of London, and through him of the Church. But does the government of England really know so very little of the temper of Englishmen as to dream that the merchants of Funchal will submit to an outrage like this? They will know well, that on their side is right and justice, and the authority of the Church; on the other, a mob of all sects, and the parliamentary tyranny of the Foreign Office. It may be that Lord Palmerston has legal power to put the nominee of the Roman Catholics, and Presbyterians, and Socinians, and No-religionists of Funchal into legal possession of the walls built by the Churchmen of Madeira for the place where they and their children might worship God. But does he dream that he can transfer the souls of men by such a proceeding? Let him observe what its religious and ecclesiastical effect will be. The Bishop will be bound more than ever to maintain the rights of the Church by continuing the licence of Mr. Lowe, and refusing to license Mr. Brown. The congregation, which has stood faithful to its pastor, will still be the assembly of the English Church in Madeira, under whatever roof it may assemble. The supporters of Mr. Brown will be the Church of the Foreign Office—the Church of Viscount Palmerston. Often, in the early ages, did the Church witness such scenes, but can it be the desire of a British Government to renew them? and can Lord Palmerston think, that, if he dares to put the insult upon the principal merchants of Madeira who are found on the side of the Church, they will be so dastardly as to give up their rights, their pastor, their Church, and their consciences, in submission to his decree? No, they have stood firm hitherto, and they will stand firm still; and, if scandal and schism ensue, they who, by abuse of human laws, eject a faithful pastor, whose authority the Church refuses to terminate, must alone bear the responsibility; and should this evil day arrive (which we will not anticipate), does Lord Palmerston doubt that the Churchmen of England will be able and willing to aid their brethren, the Churchmen of Madeira, in maintaining their pastor, even without the aid of the Treasury?

And what shall we say of the visitors? The Foreign Office, it seems, considers that they have no right to interfere in the question; it goes for nothing that the Act of Parliament recognises their right; this goes for nothing when the powers given by Parliament are used for the Church and not to her injury. But let us hear one of themselves.

> 'It is scarcely necessary to tell you,' (writes Mr. Bewicke) 'that all members of the Church of England have an equal interest in the pure and simple celebration of the services of the Church of England;' and if there is any difference in the permanence of this interest, as far as regards the services performed in this place, it must be remembered, that the greater part of the fluctuating portion of our fellow-countrymen come here with declining health, possibly after a few short months to be laid amid the crowded graves of the English cemetery. There were many who anticipated this fate; for myself, it is by the mercy of God alone I have been preserved. Can any persons have a more permanent interest in sacred things than those who are now standing on the verge of the grave? Can any need more the holy comforts of our religion than those who sit by the

tombs which have newly closed upon the dearest objects of their earthly affections?'—P. 8.

Yes indeed, no pecuniary interest can be compared to that of a devout Churchman, who, after having lived perhaps years of engrossing secular occupation in England, and being now by the hand of Providence laid aside from worldly business either for life or even for some months, resorts to Madeira, not of choice but necessity, and finds that to Mr. Lowe,[1] under God, and to those who have supported him in this struggle, he owes it, that he may receive the Bread of life weekly instead of four times in the year or less—that he may daily and twice in the day join with a congregation of his brethren in the prayers of the Church, instead of once in seven days hearing part of them read by the chaplain and responded to by a single clerk.[2]

And interests like these, which run on into eternity, which have already been experienced at the death-beds of many scores in the fourteen years of Mr. Lowe's ministration, and have made their sojourn in Madeira a time of spiritual refreshment to as many more probably, who would else have found it a dry and sandy desert; these interests are so contemptible in the eyes of the Foreign Secretary, that he thinks it absolutely unbecoming for those who feel them to put their votes in competition with those of Roman Catholics, or Presbyterians, or Socinians, or men who frequent no worship at all save that of Mammon, because these, forsooth, 'are permanent residents!' Is it, then, certain and unquestionable that money is so much more precious than souls, —time so much more permanent than eternity?

We have no doubt that the subject of these visitors is a sore one to the persecutors of the Churchmen at Madeira, and of their faithful chaplain. Not that they are unwilling to make them pay for the support of the Church; as we have already seen, that they do not find objectionable; but there they would have them stop: therefore they exclude them by hiring pews and keeping them locked (can this be legal?) and would prevent their seeing and repeating in England the course of events. For men that would do deeds of darkness in a corner, it is hard that every year should bring earnest, devout, and liberal Churchmen, many of them sick, and feeling doubly the blessings which the Church offers them, to see and report their evil deeds. Such a visitor as Lord Campden indeed might be welcome enough, but that his report of their deeds in the pamphlet before us is galling in proportion to the weight of his character and station. It is impossible not to remember, in writing these lines, the august Lady who is now seeking health in Madeira. May her visit there be a blessing, as has been the case wherever she has sojourned, to herself and those among whom she is dwelling! We doubt not that it will be so; that the Churchmen of Madeira will have cause to remember her visit with gratitude, and that the reports of visitors will no longer be treated with contempt, even by the Foreign Office, when the Queen Dowager of England has been numbered among them.

---

[1] Mr. Bewicke also shows, that even in a pecuniary point of view the visitors deserve attention; as the residents have fixed the rate of pew rents so much higher for a visitor than for a resident, that in 1844, 238 seats occupied by permanent residents paid 476 dollars, while 159 seats occupied by temporary residents paid 736.

[2] Mr. Bewicke, p. 3, mentions that this was the case at Madeira.

Art. VI.—1. *The University Censure on Dr. Hampden.* London: Fellowes. 1847.

2. *The Third Hampden Agitation.* London: Fellowes. 1847.

3. *A Letter to Lord John Russell, &c. on the bearing which the Proposed Admission of Jews to Parliament, the Nomination of Dr. Hampden, &c., have on the Revival of Convocation, &c. By the Rev.* W. J. Trower. London: Rivingtons. 1847.

4. *Are not the Clergy arraying themselves against Church and Queen? A Question. By* M. A. London: Ridgway. 1847.

5. *Letter by the Rev. F. D. Maurice, on the attempt to defeat the Nomination of Dr. Hampden.* London: Pickering. 1847.

6. *A Few Words on the Hampden Controversy. By the* Hon. and Rev. Orlando Forester, M.A. London: Seeleys. 1847.

7. *A Reply to Lord John Russell's Letter to the Remonstrance of the Bishops, against the Appointment of the Rev. Dr. Hampden to the See of Hereford. By the* Right Rev. Henry, Lord Bishop of Exeter. London: Murray. 1847.

8. *Remarks on the Protest of the Bishops against Dr. Hampden's Appointment and Lord John Russell's Reply.* London: Straker. 1847.

9. *A Letter to the Right Hon. Lord John Russell, &c. By the* Rev. R. D. Hampden, D.D., &c. London: Fellowes. 1847.

10. *A Churchman's Notes on Lord John Russell's Reply to the Bishops.* London: Rivingtons. 1847.

11. *The Royalty of the Crown in Episcopal Promotions, according to the judgment of Divines, Canonists, and others, of the Church of England.* London: Rivingtons. 1848.

12. *A Letter to the Right Hon. Lord John Russell, on the Nomination of Dr. Hampden. By* An Englishman. London: Cleaver. 1847.

13. *A Letter to the Right Hon. Lord John Russell, in reply to his Lordship's Answer to the Remonstrant Bishops; with a Postscript on Dr. Hampden's Letter. By the* Rev. W. B. Flower, B.A., &c. &c. London: Masters. 1847.

14. *An Address to the People of England on the Present Mode of Appointing Bishops.* London: Masters. 1847.

15. *Dr. Hampden's Theology other than the Catholic Faith; A Letter to the Archdeacon of Wilts, &c. By* Mayow W. Mayow, M.A., *Vicar of Market Lavington.* London: T. B. Sharpe. 1847.

16. *Religious Liberty, and the Church in Chains, &c. &c. By* James B. Sweet, *Perpetual Curate of Woodville.* London: Cleaver. 1847.

17. *Church Emancipation and Church Reform; in a Series of Letters. By* ECCLESIASTES. London; Hatchard. 1847.
18. *Convocation: What is it? A Letter to the Bishop of Exeter, in Reply to his Lordship's Perversions of the Hampden Case. By a* CHURCHMAN. London: Longmans. 1847.
19. *A Letter to the Very Rev. the Dean of Chichester, on the agitation excited by the Appointment of Dr. Hampden to the See of Hereford. By* JULIUS C. HARE, M.A., *Archdeacon of Lewes.* London: J. W. Parker. 1847.

IT has been our lot, under the character in which we are now speaking, in many instances, to vindicate or to explain certain subjects connected with the University of Oxford. What a surge and rush of subjects presents itself in this connexion: the Six Doctors—the Vice-chancellorship—the last Oxford Election—No. 90—the Ward business—the Macmullen case—the new Theological Statute—the defeated Test,—all these, topics of the day, began, and, in the main, seemed to end in Oxford. The older question of the admission of Dissenters took, in some respects, a wider range; but still Oxford has seemed to the world a sort of volcano of its own. It has smoked or flashed on its own account: igneous elements were connected with it, which perhaps were underlying the whole empire; but the actual *Campi Phlegræi* were of no great extent. Oxford is in eruption: lava has been heard of in Broad-street. This was all: it is only Oxford again. It is its way: it will begin and end in Oxford. The world's *ame damnée*—the plague-spot on the fair body of progress—the impracticable rock stretching out just where the liberal plough was going so nicely and fairly,—all these Oxford is, as a matter of course, to the politician of such days as our own: but the consolation was that it was only Oxford—a nest of bigots, it was true, but nothing more: a disagreeable and impracticable fact, but still only a fact—a single fact—a strong fact in itself, perhaps, but standing very isolated: a Gibraltar, it must be admitted, just insolently wrested from a large and showy kingdom; an obstinate mile of rough mountain bristling with ugly defences: but this was all. Its feuds were intestine and domestic. It attracted few sympathies except from Oxford men. It did not tell entirely even upon the Church: its complaints or triumphs awakened but broken echoes, except from the vanquished or victors of its own somewhat contracted battle-field. Its factions and seditions told as little on society at large as those of Coreyra upon Rome or Carthage. And yet it has been a curious phenomenon the way in which such a place as Oxford, separate and solitary, does occasionally affect the world's history. The last really great event in the history of this country is more than closely connected with Oxford. If King James had not been unhappily advised to attack the liberties of the Church in the case of Magdalene College, the Revolution had probably not been; at any rate it had not taken its actual course. So that when Oxford matters, as a fact, do amount to something of more general importance than an academical struggle, it behoves all classes to watch a process which is not of every-day occurrence, or of light interest. When Oxford does shake the country, it does it thoroughly. It is not for nothing that it is, as now, in everybody's thoughts. At this moment the whole Church of Christ is feeling the vast importance of some tedious sermons preached to an unwilling audience fifteen years ago in the University pulpit.

Now, even to repeat the various proceedings of the last few years at Oxford makes quite a catalogue. They have already been chronicled in the pages of the 'Christian Remembrancer' (vol. ix. p. 519). Suffice it to say, that from the question of the admission of Dissenters in 1834, down to the attempted condemnation of No. 90 in 1845, a common element may be observed in them all. It is a remarkable fact, that all these academical struggles, differences, trials of strength, new statutes, new tests, new boards, decrees, condemnations, and the rest, seem to centre and cluster round one individual. Dr. Hampden is the common measure of Oxford strife: since Dr. Burton's death he is the logical presence of University rebuke and disunion—*ens unum in multis*,—the point around which every element of contest and controversy has successively ranged itself. The discussion on the admission of Dissenters received its chief acrimony from Dr. Hampden, whose pamphlet on the subject, 'Observations on Religious Dissent,' perhaps his most offensive publication, first necessitated system and order in the desultory and tumultuary strategics of the movement in Oxford. The same year, 1834—it is a remarkable coincidence—witnessed the completion of the first volume of the 'Tracts for the Times,' and this pamphlet on Dissent. From that day to this, for fourteen years, we have been witnessing only combinations of the same strain, nothing more than variations on a single theme: the one cardinal fact pervades every phase of the contest. Rationalism on the one side as a principle, and Dr. Hampden as its exponent. Dogmatism as a principle, and the whole movement party, as a body, including its various degrees and modifications, on the other. This is as it should be; but, waiving for the present the moral importance and significance of the fact, we would have it and its importance clearly brought out and seen. If history could be always thus simplified—if the one pervading, persisting, obstinate element in all great struggles were marked at each stage of contest, and at every evolution of controversial tactics, if its reference to the original conception were pointed out, such would be the truest and most comprehensive historical philosophy.

In 1836 Dr. Hampden was censured by the Convocation. For some years nothing of great academical importance occurred. Dr. Godfrey Faussett, in 1838, was stirred up to deliver a sermon against Froude's Remains; but the interval between 1836 and 1841 was decidedly favourable to Catholic principles. From No. 1 to No. 90 the Tracts, with kindred writings, had won their steady way. Of course there was to be expected, and there was, a solid parallel growth of opposition, which, however, did not acquire sufficient body to make itself felt, till 1841, when its first achievement was to procure the Hebdomadal Board to express an opinion—miscalled, in some quarters, a judgment—on the Tract No. 90. Miscalled a judgment, we say, for the Hebdomadal Board possesses no legal function to express an academical judgment on any theological subject. But to connect this expression of opinion with Dr. Hampden—All boards and committees must have a leading mind; it is of the essence of these bodies to be swayed by individual power;—the active mind of the Hebdomadal Board, it is well known, was Dr. Hawkins, the Provost of Oriel, a pledged partizan of Dr. Hampden. The old *judicium* against Dr. Hampden, scarcely wrested from the reluctant consent of the heads, and resisted to the very last by Dr. Hawkins, now, and for the first time, had a chance of a reprisal. The tide had begun to turn against the Tracts; they had affronted too many cherished elements of self-indulgence and laxity to maintain, what they never sought, popularity; and, as soon as they were felt to be unpopular, an opportunity of retaliation presented itself. Drs. Faussett, Hawkins, and Hampden, had now a common cause, and they made the most of it. The author of Tract No. 90 had been forward, it was thought, in censuring Dr. Hampden; it was now his own turn to be censured;—and, in this way, it is easy to discover the connexion of the so-called censure of Mr. Newman with the Hampden case. It was only the common—may we add vulgar?—motive of turning the tables. Dr. Hampden had all along thought proper to make a personal matter of it—documents are in existence which will prove that the Regius Professor, by pointed allusions to the 'sacred profession' of one whom he chose to consider his enemy, was only withheld by such a consideration from adopting what, among laymen, would be deemed personal threats. The Hebdomadal Board was doubtless sufficiently hostile to the principles and theology of No. 90 itself; still its author was also considered in the light of a personal foe; and the champion and sponsor of Dr. Hampden, Dr. Hawkins, was the leader of the opposition among the heads of houses to him.

To pass on to the proceedings of 1842. The month of May witnessed the promulgation and enactment of the new Theological Statute, constituting a theological board of examiners, with the Royal Reader in Divinity for its head. It was at first surmised, afterwards confessed, and has ever since been boasted, that the true motive for passing this complex statute was, indirectly, to rescind the University censure of 1836 on Dr. Hampden. The new board, and the new professors, pastoral and exegetical, candidates and licentiates, students and examinations, lectures and canonries, were only the cloud of mist through which to smuggle back Dr. Hampden to his honours. The Hebdomadal Board performed a piece of cumbrous diligence, which did not so much aim at the improvement of the theological faculty, as rather sought on the sly to whitewash the concrete Dr. Hampden, under colour of legislating about an abstract Regius Professor of Divinity. That it would have been the right and consistent course to have rejected the whole scheme at once and totally, because indirectly it recognised Dr. Hampden, is more easy to observe now, and to regret, than it was to incur the odium and obloquy of such a course before the measure of the next month, June, revealed the latent object of the Theological Statute. The veil was, however, soon dropped; and the attempt of June 7 was the direct 'revival of the Hampden question,' by a proposal to repeal the No-confidence Statute of 1836. The fate of this measure is well known; but we are not writing the history of the last academical decade of years, we are only pointing out the constant presence and recurrence of the insatiable Ate of Oxford, in the person of Dr. Hampden:—

ἦ μέγαν οἴκοις τοῖσδε
δαίμονα καὶ βαρύμηνιν αἰνεῖς,
φεῦ, φεῦ, κακὸν αἶνον ἀτη-
ρᾶς τύχας ἀκορέστου.

The year 1843 was only distinguished by the private piece of injustice and cruelty executed by Dr. Wynter and the Six Doctors on Dr. Pusey: a piece of oppression from which the statute passed against Dr. Hampden, fortunately relieved him from a direct share. The fulness and vigour, however, of the Hampden influence in 1844, more than made up for its scanty, or perhaps concealed, exercise in the preceding year. The Oxford annals of 1844 were made up of the tedious Macmullen case, ranging, indeed, in all its details over two previous years, for its commencement synchronized with the attempt to revoke the Hampden censure in 1842. The whole University was now thrown into strife and heart-burning, through Dr. Hampden's attempt to convert an unstatutable practice adopted by his predecessor with reference to the B.D. degree, into a private test to be wielded according to the theological sympathies of the uncontrolled Regius Professor of Divinity. That this attempt did not succeed, was not the fault of the Hebdomadal Board; for it was the convocation of May, 1844, which, by a majority of 341 to 21, rejected the celebrated measure, which was only putting Dr. Hampden's test into the shape of a working statute.

In 1845, the same tactics were tried in connexion with the memorable Ward case. Adroitly availing themselves of the discredit which this person's publications had entailed upon the whole Catholic movement, the Hebdomadal Board, and Dr. Hampden, once more tried their favourite piece of tyranny at concocting a test, in the form of a declaration respecting the sense of subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles. This test, it is well known, and it has been stated already in these pages ('Christian Remembrancer,' vol. ix. p. 535), was carried through the Hebdomadal Board by the instrumentality of Dr. Hawkins with the concurrence of Dr. Hampden, aided by a letter from Archbishop Whately. That it never survived its rickety birth so as to be submitted to convocation—or that its substitute, the measure against No. 90, was vetoed by the Proctors—only proves the weakness of the cause itself, viz. to tie up subscription to the Articles, not the animus of the party who wished to enforce it. The very same person who in 1834 described the Articles as the remnant of a 'Scholastic Philosophy'—the last fragment of a debasing and bigoted dogmatism—the very same person, the liberal, the champion for free exposition, now came forward as the maintainer of the very opposite view. And why? Only for the sake of grasping a convenient weapon to wield upon inconvenient opponents. This was the last great occasion in which a great Faction Fight occurred at Oxford.

Here then, in every one of these perplexing cases, through the struggles and the anxieties of these ten weary years—one perpetual presence haunts the academic scene. Analyze every feud, and Dr. Hampden is the residuum. Is there an especial piece of illegal spite, such as the twice-attempted Test? it is to lodge authority in hands which will be far from loath to use it, those of Dr. Hampden. Is there one protracted attempt of power to crush an individual? Dr. Hampden is staunch in pursuit of his foe. Is there a favourable moment when the popular howl is up? Dr. Hampden is quick in seizing the right moment to catch his ancient enemy at a helpless disadvantage. Dr. Hampden retains a vivid recollection of what he is pleased to call his injuries in 1836: he has neither disavowed nor concealed his desire to retaliate upon his condemners. To censure Dr. Pusey, because Dr. Hampden was censured—to invoke against Mr. Ward a privilegium from a 'tumultuous majority,' such as that which was arrayed against Dr. Hampden—this, and the parallel has been, and might be further pursued, was quoted by Dr. Hampden's friends as a visible interposition of a just and inflexible Nemesis. But Nemesis has a subjective as well as an objective application: and to attribute to vengeance what is due to revenge is a sophism not very hazardous to venture on.

Antecedently, then—before entering into the merits of any dispute—Dr. Hampden's presence and position in Oxford has had the effect of making it a scene of successive conflicts. He has, if not fomented, at least been the voluntary or other cause of strife: where he has not come forward prominently, his indirect influence has agitated the University. He has had the wit to use the Hebdomadal Board all along to fight *his* battles—to vindicate *his* reputation—to reappropriate *his* deprived functions—to sow dissension among *his* oppressors, while they thought they were doing all sorts of things, devising tests, judging sermons or tracts, vindicating the authority of 'the resident Governor,' and the like. To those who, either as residents in Oxford, or as more closely connected with it, have not been without opportunities of watching the less prominent motives, and the secret springs connected with its later history, we owe some apology for dwelling upon what has been long familiar to them: but there are others to whom what we have said may be of service, partly to recall, and partly to group together, the various events with which Dr. Hampden's name occasionally, and his presence perpetually, both in the University and beyond it, has been associated. Dr. Hampden has given us one history of what he is pleased to call, 'his manner of life and conversation now for twelve years past.' We have done nothing more than suggest a few memoranda to complete the biography. For to write the history of the more recent Oxford politics, is to write the rise and progress of Hampdenism: the two subjects are commensurate.

And the present emergency calls rather for this general grouping together of events, the connexion of which is not on the surface. In 1836 we found ourselves protesting with the University of Oxford against this person's appointment as its Regius Professor of Divinity. The year 1847 is closing with a far more memorable and significant protest on the part—not of one of the Universities—but of a very considerable portion of the Bishops and Clergy of the Church of England against an attempt to make Dr. Hampden a Bishop. Dr. Hampden's first appointment, at the worst, was but an off-hand piece of eccentricity on the part of a cringing minister: now there is something very like a direct old-fashioned mediæval fight between Church and State. It is the Regale and Pontificale matched. It is the old story of Investitures again. The ancient battle-cry seems to ring up from the days of feudalism: and the 'Liberties of the Church' stands a chance once more of having other than an historical interest for ourselves. It is no longer an ordinary chapter in Oxford polemics. Contrasting the present with all the other incidents to which we have alluded, there is a very significant difference. Oxford—most interested—preserves a dignified and becoming silence. It is felt that the present is not a case for common-room meetings; for the routine of declarations and protests; of circulars and chairmen of committees. The University question is merged in that of the Church. Even the sharp arrowy sleet of pamphlets drives from other quarters than the Turle. For the very first time in our own experience, we have a public question—not interesting, but vital to Oxford—involving the feelings paramount in that place for twelve years, which in a fortnight produces a storm of letters, documents, pamphlets, and every variety of polemical missile, not one of which bears an Oxford imprint. This is as creditable to the grave dignity as it is to the forbearance of the residents. Such silence proclaims that the question is neither local nor academical; still less, personal. It is too serious for ordinary treatment.

Why should Lord John Russell select Dr. Hampden? is the question in everybody's mouth. To which in our judgment the fairest answer is the equally pertinent one: Why should he not? Oh! but his Churchmanship! his speech at the Mansion-house; his attendance—how often is not said—at his parish Church. This speech at the Mansion-house—we heard it—certainly amounted to enunciating the duty of a State to attend to the religion of its subjects. This was his practical view, founded upon the moral axiom, more recently stated,[1] that 'politics are not to be severed from religion.' A magnificent structure of expectations was built by well-meaning persons on this somewhat slender foundation. The fact is, that as far as he is a Churchman at all, Lord John is a disciple of Dr. Arnold. Dr. Arnold's speculations are equally of the character which suits a statesman, especially of the liberal school. Dr. Arnold argues the identity of Church and State; but the State comes first, not only practically but theoretically; the ideal Church is but a reflex of the ideal

---

[1] Debate on introducing the Jewish Disabilities Relief Bill.

State. But the State is prior in conception; the Church only a phase or manifestation of it. If we may so state it, Dr. Arnold takes a sort of Sabellian view of the Church as a mere character of the greater and higher State reality. The Church is the State working for a specific purpose and in a single direction. Of course such a theory will just suit a politician. Given the State as a fact—take it as you find it—follows the Church commensurate with it. If the State happens to consist of 'various denominations,' the Arnoldian Church is pliable and elastic and embraces them all, *vi terminorum*. What powers the State has the Church has, of the same sort and character, because in point of fact they are the same powers. So everything 'transcendental,' as has been said,—everything which brings in the notion of spiritual powers, Apostolical descent, mystery, inherent grace, of a Kingdom of Heaven, at once vanishes from this very simple conception of the Church. It is quite compatible with this view to hold a very strong tyrannical element of government. Dr. Arnold himself was not afraid of this consequence; for as he happened to think that Jews were not members of his ideal commonwealth, not citizens, he would not have recoiled with very serious alarm from applying to them as aliens at least a 'modified theory of persecution.' How far his feeling that 'had we brought the Jews here as captives, I 'should think that we ought to take them back again, and 'I should think myself bound to subscribe for that purpose,' would be inconsistent with a serious proposition to banish them, we doubt. This forcible deportation of some thousands of people, even with the salvo of a subscription list, has a good hearty twang of persecution about it. There is vigour and the strong arm of government, and very little practical liberalism in its enunciation. So that this combination of comprehension and liberality in theory, with a stout tyranny in practice, is suited for a statesman's comprehension. It fits in both with what he has to say and what he has to do. It is no wonder, then, that Dr. Arnold's Life and Correspondence is appealed to as a sort of text book for statesmen in religious matters.

If, then, Lord John Russell has seriously adopted Dr. Arnold's theory—and it seems to us that this alone reconciles certain paradoxes in his late career—and if that fair and serious aspect of sincerity, which all parties seem to recognise both in the teacher and his disciples, and which accounts entirely for a certain manifestation of a certain sort of Churchmanship in the present Premier, is, when resolved, nothing more than Arnoldism, we should say, that Dr. Hampden is the very man whom a true Arnoldian would select as the best exponent of such views. To be sure there is a marked difference between Dr. Arnold and Dr. Hampden as men. Dr. Arnold, it seems, was so amiable and winning, that many are almost disposed to forget his most grave errors and heresy as a theologian in personal attachment to the man. Churchmen have coquetted overmuch with Dr. Arnold and his school. His friends and disciples have powers—kindness—character and acquirements: but it is high time to remind people what lies on the other side—a principle, as is shown elsewhere in the present number of this Review, utterly destructive of the very being of the Church. Now Dr. Arnold's was a magnetic mind; of Dr. Hampden's personal friends, it so happens that we never heard. Of course it may be accounted for without charging him with moroseness or sullenness. But whatever the ethical difference in character between Dr. Arnold and Dr. Hampden, it is well known that Dr. Arnold committed himself to Dr. Hampden. Nay, he did more: he committed himself—and that most grievously—for Dr. Hampden. The article upon the 'Oxford malignants,' betraying such passions as must ever prevent Dr. Arnold maintaining a claim to heroic goodness—an article which, if written by any other person, would be sufficient proof of very low morality even in the author—was Dr. Arnold's deliberate testimony to the justice of Dr. Hampden's cause. 'Hampden'—we fear that this particular testimony to the character of his labours, will be thought by those most interested, scarcely consistent with the character of the representative of pure Reformation principles which he now claims—'Hampden is doing what real Christian reformers 'have ever done; what the Protestants did with Catholicism, 'and the Apostles with Judaism.' This is Dr. Arnold's judgment of Dr. Hampden's qualifications as a reformer and developer of 'Protestantism,' because 'the time is come when the phraseology of the articles requires to be protested against,' and he openly throws out (vol. ii. p. 39) the hypothesis, 'if Hampden is to be made a Bishop,' &c. Now Lord Melbourne promoted Dr. Arnold to his professorship, and would, it is said, have given him a Bishopric, had not an intimation, the same in character, and from the same ecclesiastical authority, been presented to the Premier of 1837, which the Premier of 1847 affects to ignore. But it was—so it is rumoured—a matter of direct complaint to Lord Melbourne from Lord John Russell, that the first Whig government had not made Dr. Hampden a Bishop. Lord John's line is a certain fool-hardiness which passes for chivalry; and if we bear in mind both Dr. Hampden's connexion with Dr. Arnold,—the open way in which his cause has been defended by M. Bunsen and the Archbishop of Dublin—the interest which the former exercises at Court, and the claims for old Whig services even upon an English Metropolitan throne, which the latter would willingly forego for the sake of the promotion of such an ally as Dr. Hampden—together with the Premier's willingness to do a bold thing, as a proof of a strong government, not perhaps without the wish to escape even from that growing, but inconvenient, reputation for Churchmanship, which might prove troublesome in a parliament composed as the new one is—in all these things, we see quite enough to account for the selection of Dr. Hampden for the See of Hereford.

To account for it, but hardly in a political view to justify it. *We* have the gravest faults to charge against the selection; but simply as a political error it is culpable. It will bear canvassing as ill in the windows of the Reform Club as in an Oxford Common-room. A statesman is bound to take into consideration the state of the public mind; if ignorant of it, his first duty is to acquire information on it. Facts abundantly prove either an ignorance which is in itself inexcusable, or a woful miscalculation. Even the liberal press rather defends than applauds. The Whigs begin to feel that Dr. Hampden was hardly worth his powder. If Lord John ever achieves historical fame, it will be as a politician; but so serious a political blunder, one akin to that which turned Sacheverell into a questionable sort of confessor, will prevent his taking high rank as a statesman. Simple fanaticism could be his only apology; but then the Premier has never shown sufficient of an ebullient zeal for any religious profession to adopt this—perhaps his most decorous—excuse.

There is only one view of Lord John Russell's policy, which perhaps is consistent and tenable; and though it is the most obvious, and perhaps the true one, we are somewhat loath to mention it. It may be described perhaps, as a deliberate and calculated design to bring the Church down—to prove to all the world that the Church of England is a mere creature of the State—to dispose of all her high pretensions, pretensions, too, which have neither slept nor been curtailed during the last dozen years, by an intelligible act of despotism and tyranny—to show all her enemies on the right hand and on the left, that her succession is a thing of State sufferance, her doctrine a piece of parliamentary permission, her spiritual authority but a repealable statute, her bishops and priests only a respectable kind of police. It certainly looks more like this than anything else. The Government had recently acquired odium in 'forcing a Bishop' on the reluctant heathenism of Manchester. 'No new Bishops,' was a sort of electioneering cry; Mr. Macaulay had lost the metropolis of John Knox's religion for voting for the increase of the Episcopate. Something must be done to show the 'dissenting interest' that 'Tractarian' influences had not overawed Downing-street. We must prove by a bold course that we do not think Bishops any thing very transcendental; to promote another Elliott, or a Villiers, or a Russell, is only the old story; a Mercury may be made of any block. What is wanted now is to show, that in the Whig estimate, though we may consent to making new Bishops, we despise them: *fiat experimentum in corpore vili.* If Dr. Hampden is made a Bishop, we shall at least hear no more of our Hyper-Episcopalian tendencies.

Now, clever as all this is, we cannot quite see the use of it, or that, upon the same calculation of interests, it was worth while to take the step. But this is the minister's concern, not ours. We waive the discussion on this question. If it be said that Lord John was simply politic in his nomination, we think it a political blunder: the excuse of fanaticism will hardly avail, for it is rather too broad and bold an instalment of that particular vice for a beginner in the zealot's line: the discredit of a mere piece of wanton folly and sheer unreasoning arrogance, it is not decorous to urge against any English minister, not quite fair either in this particular case. The view that it is the result of a decided and combined attempt to engraft fairly the spirit and principles of Dr. Arnold, under the auspices, perhaps under the advice, of M. Bunsen and Dr. Whately, upon the Church of England, and thus in the See of Hereford actually to give us the first instalment of the Church of the Future, seems to ourselves the most rational account of an event which, under any other aspect, is as useless and improvident, in the way of insult, as it is short-sighted in policy, while malignant in intention.

To describe the effect of the announcement is superfluous. None of our readers require to be reminded—though they may not object to see it recorded—how deep and universal has been the feeling which this event has called out—how the first 'withering fear and dumb amazement' was succeeded by a burst of indignation so vast and unparalleled, that we care rather to describe it by facts than by an amplification of language. It was on Monday, 15th of November, that the 'Times,' informally of course, announced the appointment, and, though the steady supporter of Government, has denounced it in a series of articles as remarkable for power as for moderation. Immediately the clergy began to protest publicly and privately: they met by parishes, by rural deaneries, by archdeaconries; in every possible way, judiciously, and occasionally with precipitancy, they poured in a flood of remonstrance—to the Queen, to the Premier (a blunder in our judgment), to the Bishops, they appealed—to the former for redress, to the latter for protection. The Dean and Chapter of Hereford had some time ago, we are informed, received upwards of 200 addresses of counsel and sympathy. And as early as the first week in December, thirteen Bishops, the most prudent, and estimable, and learned on the bench, testified, in a conjoint letter (the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Ripon in separate communications,) to the 'apprehension and alarm which had been excited in the minds of the 'clergy by the rumoured nomination,' coupled with the very significant intimation—significant, that is, to all except one labouring under something akin to a divine hardening—that to persist in the appointment would be to involve 'the greatest 'danger both of the interruption of the peace of the Church, 'and of the disturbance of the confidence which it is most de'sirable that the clergy and laity of the Church should feel in 'every exercise of the Royal Supremacy, especially as regards 'that very delicate and important particular, the nomination to 'vacant Sees.' Whatever other character this important document has, its first and most obvious value is in the proof which it bears to the extent and amount of feeling on the question. Bishops—English Bishops—Bishops ranging in theological sympathies from Exeter to Winchester—Bishops of the peculiar caution and discretion so well known in Drs. Kaye and Turton, *ex. grat.*, are not over-likely to commit themselves to an unguarded statement of a mere matter of fact. The Episcopal remonstrance, then, is more than an adequate answer to the unparalleled mendacity which asserts either the poverty or the party character of the opposition.

But more than this—it were ungracious to accept the address of the thirteen, or rather fifteen, Bishops as a mere statement of a single fact countersigned and authenticated by the competent authority. It is a new thing for Bishops, themselves the creation of a compact or alliance, call it what we will, not of three hundred years' standing, but more or less coeval with Constantine's dotation, to announce that this most ancient arrangement or machinery of State nominations has become so 'delicate,' in its adjustment or working, that a single event will, in their judgment, disturb it—perhaps stop it. Why should the Bishops say this, unless there were a cause? Their interests were not endangered, the privileges of their order were not invaded in the sense of any temporal hazard or loss; Dr. Hampden's promotion disappointed no secular expectations among the remonstrant bishops. The Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London were hardly on the look-out for the See of Hereford. If the reclamation was only that of a 'Tractarian' clique, would the Bishop of Winchester—would the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol—have indorsed it? If it were the mere prolongation of an university dispute, why should the Bishops of London, and Bangor, and Ely, and Lincoln, stand sponsors to a defunct, or partial, Oxford controversy? It must have been for more than to acknowledge the mere fact of the existing excitement among the clergy that the fifteen Bishops came forward. We claim boldly, on the part of the Church of England, its full weight for the episcopal protest, in that candid, open, patent construction which this act of more than the majority of its prelates, as a fact, bears as well in the eyes of foes as of friends. It was because the Catholic Faith is endangered, that the guardians of her faith were enabled—may we say? permitted and strengthened—to plead for it. Other influences than those of mere secular policy are at work, as we trust, both around us and in us. As it is not for nothing that we have been entrusted with a charge, so, though we may have much to regret in our negligent handling or hold of the terrible and tremendous deposit of the 'faith once committed,' we shall not be permitted to have it silently dropped, or plundered. The spirit which gave it can move the hearts of men 'when It listeth.' But we forbear these considerations, content only to call attention to what struck us as the feature which, whether we press it or not, has impressed many.

And this is the utter unexpectedness of such a protest in such a quarter. Antecedently, the most sanguine speculator could hardly have looked for it; and, just at this juncture, we may as well own it, there was a good deal to distress and harass earnest minds. It must have been so; we all know that it was so, or why the need, just now, of such works as Dr. Pusey's last Preface, or Mr. Keble's Preface to his recent Sermons? We care not to be explicit: but men began to be asking, we admit, in a faithless way, for signs; they were pleading for tokens; they complained of the faintness or uncertainty of our notes. Now, though ordinarily, this craving after signs is but a 'tempting of the Lord,' yet, it may be, 'that the Lord Himself shall give you a sign.' And though this fixing upon this or that event as *the* sign, may be dangerous, yet we ask for any more rational solution of the present events than this; viz. that we are in some very remarkable way going through a sifting course, which will *prove* what we are, and Whose we are. For the first time, a 'Reformed' and 'Established,' and in some sense 'Protestant,' Church, has found a voice in its Bishops to deprecate heterodoxy. For the first time, a Dean has been found openly to challenge the Prime Minister to inflict upon him the pains of 'the most hateful and tyrannical law' which disgraces our Statute Book rather than violate his conscience by electing one, against whom the collective testimony of the Church protests. Come what may of these proceedings, they constitute a sign not to be spoken lightly of; and gratitude is even due to the unhappy instrument who has been—it may be—overruled to force from the Church of England that indignant appeal, in the face of all Christendom, which no failure in details can lessen or efface. Who, amidst past distresses and perplexities, could have anticipated such an evidence of energy and spiritual life? And that it was vouchsafed at such a juncture, in the midst of those Advent warnings—'men's hearts failing them for 'fear, and for looking after those things which are coming upon 'the earth,'—in the very week when the solemn prayer was daily offered, that 'He, who purchased to Himself an universal 'Church by the precious blood of His dear Son, would so guide 'and govern the minds of His servants, the bishops and pastors 'of His flock, that they may lay hands suddenly on no man,' made the testimony doubly significant.

Lord John Russell's reply to the communication of the Bishops is dated 8th December; and on the same day he thought proper to read a lecture on Christian charity, and his views of University law, to some hundreds of the laity, persons of the highest distinction in rank, literature, and the clerkly professions. We are not called upon to pause much upon these documents; though a word which would be wasted on their arguments may be spared on the temper which they display. And as our readers have doubtless, with keen satisfaction, seen the Bishop of Exeter's masterly and true-hearted rebuke of the small sophistries of the Premier, as well as other publications on that side, we will present them, with a criticism from a quarter favourable to the writer, with which they are not very likely to have met. And while the testimony of the 'Weekly Dispatch,' in favour of Dr. Hampden, has another value, it has this importance in showing that Lord John's letters present but one aspect to the common mind, that of being nothing more real or dignified than a sharp, snarling, little piece of retort. How far such a tone was worthy of the occasion or the writer we forbear to remark:—

> 'His reply is a choice morsel of criticism. How cleverly he hits the cowardice of the Bishops in not avowing their own conviction of Dr. Hampden's heresy, but falling back upon the alarms of others. How neatly he reminds them of their having (some of them at least) required candidates for Holy Orders to have attended the lectures of this obnoxious Professor. How cavalierly he sets aside the authority of the University of Oxford, like one who was mindful of its expulsion of John Locke. How quiet his allusion to the poor old Primate, whose repose at Lambeth is likely to be sorely disturbed. And what a significant hint is given of that supreme authority vested in her who inherits the throne of Elizabeth and of Henry VIII.; the living head of the Church and disposer of its dignities; the Lady Pope of Anglican Protestantism. The Episcopal knuckles are

smartly rapped by his Lordship; and the royal *congé d'élire* goes to Hereford as if nothing had happened.'—*Weekly Dispatch, Dec.* 19.[1]

Yes; Lord John's 'sarcastic logic,' and 'choice morsels of criticism;' his 'clever hits,' and 'neat reminders;' his 'quiet allusions,' and 'significant hints,' and 'smart raps,' and all his other playful polemics, had but just this little fault—they were too clever. The occasion was not one of squibbing and snip-snap. All along the Premier seems to have misunderstood and blundered about the moral value of the whole case. History tells of other such mistakes: James II. committed one, in underrating the occasion when he ordered the Declaration to be read, as though there were nothing out of the common way in it;—Charles X. did the same, when he allowed Prince Polignac to issue the Ordinances, and went hunting;—and so, doubtless, Lord John chuckled grimly, when he had sent the twin letters, and calmly turned over his blotting-book as if nothing had happened.

Lord John's reply to the Bishops, though dated 8th December, was not delivered till the night of Thursday, the 9th, and the correspondence was published in 'the Times' of Monday, the 13th. Meanwhile the Bishop of Exeter's letter was written, and in print on the evening of the same day, and was published in the 'Times' and 'Post' of Tuesday the 14th, so that the 'clever morsel of criticism,' like other clever morsels, did not linger long on the public palate: the delicate gusto of Downing street was expelled, next morning, by the stronger flavour of Exeter; and Lord John's claims to a distinguished place in the 'Complete Letter-Writer' were effaced by one whose letters unite the forcible style and condensed scornful criticism of a professed reviewer, with the weighty indignation and solemnity of a Christian prelate. The Bishop of Exeter's powers in this particular range of composition, uniting severity with dignity, and combining argument with contemptuous retort, are too well known for us to enlarge upon them. Lord John's cleverness had simply been effaced as by a chemical agent—it vanished without a trace—his wiliness had found something quite as subtle, and a little more permanent. Lord John had lived and was not—he was like the May-fly in Callcott's glee:—

---

[1] It would be unfair to Dr. Hampden not to allow him the weight of the sincere opinion formed of him by this writer; certainly not the least shrewd or talented of his friends. It is well to know, in addition to the testimonies to Dr. Hampden's merits, from 'several Prelates of our Church,' that he also enjoys the patronage and perusal of 'Publicola' of the 'Weekly Dispatch.' We add a passage which precedes the extract in the text:—

'Dr Hampden is a sound philosopher, but an unsound believer. He has more faith in the moral nature of man than in the three creeds. His writings are in a wise and lofty spirit; but they are not in the spirit of the Catechism and Prayer-book. It is vain to blink the fact, that the man is a heretic; and the heretic is too much of a true man to be fit for a Church-of-England Bishop, if we take the constitution of the Church itself for a standard. Here is the weak point of the appointment. The Church demands orthodoxy of all, and especially of its prelates. Technically, the reply is good, that Dr. Hampden has subscribed the Thirty-nine Articles. But what is it morally? Dr. Hampden would have been a greater man had he kicked the mitre with his foot instead of bowing his head to wear it. He might have risen to martyrdom; he only sinks into a bishopric.'

> 'Poor insect! what a little day
> Of sunny bliss is thine!
> And yet thou spread'st thy light wings gay,
> And bidd'st them spreading shine.
>
> 'Thou humm'st thy short and busy tune,
> Unmindful of the blast,
> And careless while 'tis burning noon,
> How short that noon has past!'

And now was the Premier's hour of grace. 'Forbear, my lord, 'while you have yet time; persist not in your rash experiment '—retrace your steps.' The warning was solemnly uttered, and dutifully; but there are ominous sounds, even those rare ones of a bishop's warning, which devoted ears may not hear; the presage came from a quarter where the Premier had learned in bygone days to tremble; the warning was grave;

> 'Nomenque erat auguris ingens;
> Spernit Echionides tamen hunc, ex omnibus unus
> Contemptor Superûm, Pentheus; præsagaque ridet
> Verba senis;'—

And on the 17th December, the Friday in Ember Week, the Congé d'Elire and Letters Missive, containing the fatal name of Hampden, were sent down to Hereford. On Monday, the 20th, the 'Times' published Dean Merewether's formal petition to the Queen, of the same date, the 17th, as the receipt of the Letters Missive, to be released from the election—a document, we venture to say, of which the actual value in invigorating English hearts is incalculable—a document which will possess historical weight and interest in days now far distant, as the petition of the Seven Bishops possesses in our own days; and for which the thanks of the whole Church are due to the writer. The receipt of the Dean's memorial was curtly acknowledged by Sir George Grey, with the notice that the Queen had 'no commands.' On the 27th instant appeared a document, if possible, of greater energy; Dean Merewether's memorable letter to Lord John Russell, reciting the whole deplorable case, announcing that every means had been tried to avert the blow, that a correspondence had passed, that interviews had taken place, in which Lord John had persisted in his determination 'to let the law take its course,' but concluding with the assurance, that in spite of what nearly amounted to 'threats' on the Premier's part, 'no power on earth' should induce him to consent to the election.

And on the 28th of December,—immediately after that significant second lesson which announced an Apostle's protestation from the authority of a cold-hearted political deputy, the Russell of his country—at last, when it was found that an appeal to the royal tribunal of justice had failed, the Lady Chapel of Hereford witnessed an appeal to a greater judgment-seat than that of Cæsar. A majority of the Capitular body went through the form of an election—the Dean and Canon Huntingford being dissentient. This was to have been expected. The Dean openly declared that the Statutes required the election to be unanimous;—which it was not; and that the Dean and three Residentiaries must be parties assenting; which they were not. Under this view, which we believe to be the legal one, the election being void, will be annulled at confirmation—the next stage in the proceedings. And, quitting here the historical part of our task, we may conclude it with the well-omened words with which the bishops left the court of James II.—'The will of God be done.'

And we have arrived at something more than the crowning-point of this particular and single narrative—at something more important to the interests of this kingdom than this the fitting catastrophe of the 'Hampden controversy.' Even in that, the less prominent light, this great Hampden case has been, at last, fairly played through. It has had its beginning, middle, and end; it is a true and perfect drama. It has a technical and rigid unity. It is one, whole and perfect, and has unfolded itself legitimately. From the first, there was a largeness and solidity in the question. It began well, and it has ended well. A protest, and a successful one for the doctrinal purity of the English Church, outraged in one of its chief seats and fountains of learning, has ended in a protest, and an influential one, for its spiritual rights. Depth and consistency have marked every successive stage of the case. It was for the purity of the faith that the University censured Dr. Hampden as a teacher of the Church's faith—it is for the purity of the faith that the Church has rejected him as a guardian of the Church's faith. Nothing less than the very highest, and most hallowed, and vital interests of the Church—its soundness in 'the Catholic faith'—being at issue, could have justified this protracted and painful struggle. For a less cause than this, such a triumph would not have been permitted. And comparing the present with the other historical grounds for rejecting an undue exercise of the Regale which may seem parallel to the present case, Dr. Hampden's spiritual incapacity for the Episcopate arises from a cause much more grave and serious. It is this fact which gives its critical and decisive character and mark to the case.

In the troubles of Archbishop Becket the principle contended for was the same, and the difficulties which the high-minded and uncalculating assertion of them had to contend with were the same. For, in 1163, as well as in 1847, could be found Bishops of England who contended, 'that the world must obey the 'world's laws; and that, by sacrificing the liberty of the Church, 'they in no way compromised the Church itself—indeed, to do 'so were rather to strengthen it; "for," said they, "an obsti-'nate resistance can end in nothing but our own ruin, whereas, 'by giving way to the king on this point, we may retain our 'inheritance in God's sanctuary, and repose in the peaceable 'possession of our churches: for we are placed in difficult cir-'cumstances, and the temper of the times requires of us large 'concessions."' This was the language on one side; and it is equally true and thankworthy that the opposite language of the Archbishop might pass for one of Dean Merewether's true-hearted appeals, 'You disguise to yourselves your cowardice under the 'name of patience, and, on the pretext of concession, you would 'enslave the spouse of Christ. The cause of God is not so ill 'supported as to require the fall of man that it may stand. Nor 'is the Most High at a loss for means to uphold His Church, 'though unaided by the truckling policy of its [dignitaries].' What is asked by the State now was asked then, only 'to 'conform unreservedly to the usages of this kingdom,' which very request now, as then, is admitted, 'consistently with the 'privileges of the Church of Christ.' In the days of Becket indeed, this lofty language was used about the respective rights of the civil and ecclesiastical courts over criminous clerks: in our own times, peril to a sound confession of the truth of the cardinal doctrine of the Most Blessed Trinity itself has awakened it; but the language is in both cases the language of the Church opposing and protesting against the world and its powers.

So again in the days of S. Anselm. Far are we from undervaluing the principle which involved him in his life-long dispute about investitures. We admit to the full how deeply the liberties of the Church may be perilled, especially in a formal ceremonial stage of society, by what seems so very a trifle as this or that hand giving ring and pastoral staff. But in a practical, and as it is called, sensible age of the world, it is something to find, that if the Church and the world must be fairly pitted, when a fight *à l'outrance* is inevitable, that it should be about creeds rather than copes. The last have their value: and if it is once fairly made known and admitted on both sides, that the two parties have rested the whole question of Church rights and Church authority on so insignificant a subject as a surplice, and that this, and nothing less than this is at issue, the battle may as well be taken upon 'the Prayer-for-the-Church-militant question,'—to name the most insignificant point conceivable, as on any other. Only the difficulty is to make—by-standers certainly, and sometimes, even—the combatants feel what they are contending about. In this instance, the whole world can see what is at issue—creeds, and nothing else. This is an intelligible issue. The *casus belli* is formidable, all admit. It is something that the scoffer says of 'the Church of England that it does not require merit, but '*conformity; not mind, but* FAITH.'—(*Weekly Dispatch.*) Just so: we accept the distinction, and the character which it implies. We know, and every body knows, what we are now fighting for.

Once more: in the very last case in which the Regale and Pontificale came into direct collison, and the victory—chiefly, perhaps in remembrance of the Church's sin, in the events connected with the Revolution of 1688—was with the secular power in suppressing the Church's legislative functions in Convocation, it would be an insult to the memory of even Bishop Hoadly, to suppose that the question at issue in the Bangorian controversy, great as it was, came up to that involved in the appointment of Dr. Hampden.

And if we claim in this sort of way an advantage—not that our cause is better than that of our fathers, but—that it is more intelligible, the particular form in which the secular and spiritual powers have clashed, is, perhaps, the most happy which could have been selected. If it has begun to be felt, that, whatever value and meaning the Royal Supremacy had while it was a fact, and when wielded by the vigorous hands of Tudor and Stuart in the days of Divine Right, and displayed in the mixed person of the Anointed Sovereign Lord and Master, the one and sole visible impersonation of Power, all these advantages became questionable as soon as the English Monarchy degenerated into a theory, a still more vulnerable part of the old Church-and-State system presented itself in the statute about the election of Bishops. If the Royal Supremacy itself has so far, from the stress of circumstances, and the irreversible tide of liberal opinions, changed its character, that it amounts to the Supremacy of the Prime Minister—himself an officer not recognised by statute law—and if the Supremacy of the Prime Minister is, in fact, only an accident of the polling-booths;—if this is found a difficulty hard to reconcile with a living view of a living Church, what defence could be set up for the particular mode in which this very inconsistent creature, the Supremacy, chose to exhibit itself? Human fancy in its wildest vagaries could not picture a more complete theoretical absurdity, than the English election of Bishops. To give in form a licence for a free election, and yet in fact to prescribe under the most severe penalties, even to that of perpetual imprisonment, and loss of all preferment and worldly goods to the electors, the single person who alone must be elected —to require in the same statute the most solemn deliberation and prayer before election, and the necessity of giving due attention to the meetness of the person elected, and yet to give no choice even between two nominees—to link together fate and freedom—to put the Congé d'Elire whose very essence is freedom of *election*, and the Letters Missive the only notion of which is direct immediate *nomination*, into the same official envelope—to enact by statute this cumbrous farce of an election, where there is no choice, in one clause, and in the very next to provide for its failure, and to supersede it, by what would have saved all these words and parchment, the simple *sic volo sic jubeo* of letters patent—all this had only to be known to crumble away at the very lightest touch, like the buried bodies of old Etruscan kings, which sleep in solemn state and regal splendour, till the first flash of daylight melts them into something less substantial than dust itself. Whatever the present age is, it is not an age of shams and sillinesses, and mere idle old worn-out act-of-parliament paper bugaboos. And of all the insults, not so much to such a corporate existence as the Church, but to the human mind itself; of all the deplorable and melancholy monuments of folly and weakness, coupled alas! with desperate wickedness, which history has to recall, let the theory according to statute law of an Anglican Election of a Bishop bear the palm. It is nothing to say that English common sense has kept the absurdity in decent concealment; or practically has checked and neutralized it: wherever an injustice and a folly lurks, under the awful name of law, some unjust man, or some fool, somebody weak enough, or wicked enough, will be found to bring it into a little brief and noxious vigour and activity. To be sure, its first pranks are its last. The trial by duel was on the Statute Book, and some wily Old Bailey practitioner knew it, and brought it into court thirty years ago: the consequence was disastrous to society, for the murderer was let loose upon it, though the law itself was instantly repealed. So, with the statute of Præmunire: 'the law must take effect,' says Lord John Russell, though he knows at the very moment of uttering this pompous and pedantic phrase of tyranny, that there is not a man within the four seas who would or could defend such a monstrous, glaring, wicked absurdity.

The Statute under which English Bishops are elected—elected!—is that of 25 Henry VIII. cap. 20, sec. iv. v. vii. Its birth dates A.D. 1533; and we really believe that it was very little known except as a sort of antiquarian curiosity, till Mr. Hurrell Froude, in the year 1833, published a vigorous series of papers upon it in the then palmy days of the 'British Magazine.' He not only analyzed the whole process, and dwelt with burning indignation on its details of oppression and absurdity, but he actually foresaw that this choice instrument of tyranny would be selected by Whig statesmen as the means of introducing the principle of Latitudinarian Bishops into the Church, to be nominated and selected simply as Latitudinarians, and as a premium upon Latitudinarianism. Forewarned, forearmed, as soon as this Statute was known, its ultimate fall was sealed. The age could not endure the hateful presence. And yet we all knew in what quarter the storm would burst; the weakest part in the old walls being once known, it required but little seership to guess where the fabric would first break down. Everybody saw that the ancient arrangement must sooner or later give way, and that the mind of the English Church could not live for ever on the dry husks of a Tudor Supremacy, especially if entrusted to the tender mercies of a Whig—possibly a Socinian—Premier. That the relations of Church and State must before long be remodelled, and that in no inconsiderable degree, all men knew, and many felt that if this reconstruction was forced upon either party in a hostile form, the Statute of Election of Bishops would be the first point of assault. And so it has turned out. We are either too earnest, or too sensible, or too stupid, or too liberal, or too practical, or too impracticable, to go on with puerile abstract theories, with grotesque contradictions to common honesty and common sense; and so the end of *præmunire* and *provisors* has begun. Its three-hundredth anniversary saw its death-blow struck—was it unawares?—by that solitary man in a solitary room at Oxford. It had prolonged its hateful and deceitful reign of compromise and shallow cold hypocrisy from 1533 to 1833: violated oaths, blasted consciences, vows bartered for pelf, the loss of Grace, the sneer of enemies, the sorrow of friends, duty explained away, and the pleadings of the Spirit, stifled, smothered, choked; these were its triumphs and its trophies. It has run its weary course of wickedness, and even now the day breaks. The prophetic period has come:—

> 'Hic jam ter centum totos regnabitur annos,
> Gente sub Hectorea: donec *regina sacerdos*,'

our own anointed Sovereign, shall erase from the Statute Book the foulest mockery which ever contaminated the name of Law.

Nor must we forget—what has been elsewhere noticed—under what remarkable associations the ancestral names of Russell and Hampden once more achieve notoriety. 'The 'name of Russell,' Lord John has been told, 'ought to be a 'security to us against the application by him of a phrase so 'sacred as the "rights of the Crown," to a matter so foul, as the 'Statute of Præmunire.' It is something more than significant that the grisly phantom of King Henry's tyranny should be evoked by a Russell in behalf of a Hampden. The cycle is about complete. One Russell shed his blood in what was called patriotism; another Russell forfeits his name for the 'Magna Charta of tyranny.' One Hampden died as a rebel and a traitor; another who bears the name, will be handed down to posterity as the voluntary champion of secular tyranny, and as the hired violator of the rights of conscience. Truly modern liberalism unites the most opposite paradoxes: the wildest license in speculation with the most arbitrary exercise of unconstitutional power. It is not for nothing that the righteous blood of More and Fisher will be avenged, in this futile attempt to revive their murderer's despotism, in the person of one whose race was first ennobled and enriched by that murderer's sacrilege and spoliation of the Church.

But what of him whose name is so prominently connected with these proceedings? Where is Dr. Hampden all this time? We have traced him as the secret spring and centre of Oxford troubles through the last dozen years; and we have found him Bishop-designate of Hereford. The prize for which he has laboured is at length within his grasp. He 'retracts nothing and disclaims nothing.' The Hampden of 1833 is the Hampden of 1847. He is at least consistent. As soon as the first sign of commotion was heard, Dr. Hampden advertised a letter to the Premier. It was to appear immediately. It was advertised in November. It is dated 9th December. It was published, a meagre seventeen pages, on 16th December. We beg to remark that the date 9th December is purely arbitrary. The Bishops' Remonstrance was in Lord John Russell's possession at least before the 8th, for his reply bears that date. Does Dr. Hampden pretend that he published his pamphlet in ignorance of the address of the thirteen Bishops? No; he assigned an early date to his letter in order that it might pass for being written antecedently to the Bishops' appeal. And yet even this clever device was rather too clever: it was transparent. Is the Oxford press so slow—by the way the letter bears no imprint—that it took seven days to print, and stitch, and publish a single sheet? Everybody knows what printers can do when the author has the will. The Bishop of Exeter could not have seen—did not see—Lord John's reply to the laity till the morning of the 13th, and yet his vigorous postscript was written—for it bears that date—and, together with the whole pamphlet, was set up, worked off, and published, before seven o'clock on the evening of this very 13th. Dr. Hampden must have seen the Bishops' letter before his own was published, we believe before it was even in type. But that document was a fact either too inconvenient to grapple with, or too trivial to notice. At any rate, he condescends to pass it over *sub silentio.* These details are characteristic, and display temper.

Of the substance of Dr. Hampden's Letter we hardly trust ourselves to speak with patience. Even his friends—such as the 'Daily News'—condemned it as poor and unsatisfactory. In composition it is only a frigid repetition of the inaugural lecture; in language it is hesitating and perplexed. It is written under the ugly necessity of saying something with actually nothing to say. In substance, it may be divided into three parts—a vindication of himself as personally orthodox; a Pharisaic recapitulation of his own many virtues and claims to preferment; and a bitter personal attack upon his enemies.

As to Dr. Hampden's personal orthodoxy, we have not a word to say. The charge against him—it has never varied, or betrayed itself into inconsistency—is, not that he is a Socinian, but that he has advocated a theory more mischievous and wider than Socinianism itself. It is not the simple vice of heresy on this or that article of the Creed that he is charged with, but the larger principle of the non-necessity of any creeds. He is accused not of a false dogmatism, but of anti-dogmatism, which is a far heavier imputation. He denies the saving necessity of *any* strict theological doctrine. Like his friend and apologist, Mr. Winstanley Hull,[1] Dr. Hampden may say, 'I fully believe, 'after a long and careful investigation, the Catholic faith to be 'what is commonly stated in the Creed commonly called the Creed 'of Athanasius; but,' he will add, 'it is most positively false 'that he who does not keep that faith whole and undefiled shall, 'without doubt, perish everlastingly.' For, 'the damnatory 'clauses are not in the Bible, nor can they be proved thereby.' So Dr. Hampden may say (p. 9), 'Most sincerely and most 'firmly do I believe that there is but one Catholic faith—one 'invariable standard of orthodox truth; and that all departures 'from this, consequently, are Errors of Doctrine and Corrup'tions of the Truth, and not that "form of sound words" which 'God has set forth to us in his Revelation.' Probably:—Dr. Hampden and Mr. Hull are very fortunate. By a happy accident their personal convictions happen to be exactly coincident and identical with the Athanasian statements. But this is not the question: the *ignoratio elenchi* is too wilful and patent. What of those whose 'long and careful investigation,' just as honest, and as scrupulous, and as patient as Dr. Hampden's, has led them to an opposite conclusion? What, for example, of Dr. Hampden's friend and guide, Mr. Blanco White? Was he dishonest, or careless, or ignorant, or superficial? What of the common run of Socinians? Why, as he has 'nothing to retract, nothing to disclaim,' he still 'ventures to call Unitarians' not only 'Christians,' but 'our brethren in the faith,' although 'they will not assent to his metaphysical conclusions.' The question is, not about Dr. Hampden's faith, but, about the saving efficacy of these very 'metaphysical conclusions.' And it is in this way that we think the quotations and extracts from Dr. Hampden's works do not adequately state the charge against him. It is not in the nature of the case that they can do so. It is not that they are garbled and one-sided, but they are insufficient. Bad as Dr. Hampden's theology may appear by a series of extracts, infinitely worse is it by a steady perusal of his Bampton Lectures. The book is not a counter argument against any decision of the Church, but a long elaborate argument to show that the Church had no inherent right to conclude, infer, state, prove, or impose at all. He passes by this or that dogmatic assertion with contemptuous indifference: he may happen, by his own private process of reasoning, to agree with it; others may not. There is neither merit nor blame on either side; for 'no conclusions 'of human reason, however correctly deduced, however logically 'sound, are properly religious truths,' and 'it by no means 'follows, that what can be proved out of Scripture, must, there'fore, be truth of Revelation,' since 'all belief as such is invo'luntary.' If a man 'professes and calls himself' a Christian, he is a Christian 'in the charitable sense of the term,'—a sense in which he may be reckoned among 'our brethren in the faith,' a sense in which his 'mode of reasoning' will not hurt him.

---

[1] 1845. The month of January. Oxford, p. 15.

But a view of Dr. Hampden's theology is incomplete without adverting to its tendencies. The name of Mr. Blanco White suggests something more than an anticipation of what it would run to with a free course for its development. Dr. Hampden's own career can only be fairly judged by a careful attention to that of his friend and monitor, Mr. Blanco White. This gentleman supplies the practical conclusion to Dr. Hampden's theoretical premises. We avail ourselves of the opportunity of placing, in a more permanent and accessible position, the facts contained in an able article which appeared in the 'Times' of Christmas Day:—

'We do not know who are Dr. Hampden's present advisers, or whether that gentleman is open to counsel at all, but we think it must strike everybody how much service they would render to him and to the Church, if they could induce him to publish, not a retractation, but just a candid review of his Bampton Lectures. There are not many men who will *retract* when they have once been put on their mettle. But there are many men, many living men, who have committed themselves on theological, political, economical, and even on physical questions, and have afterwards "told truth and shamed the devil" by avowing the results of maturer and more deliberate inquiry. There is, indeed, scarcely any man of any mark in the kingdom who has not given that last proof of sincerity which is implied in a frank renunciation of error. Opinion is a matter not only of intuitive perception, or immediate inspiration, but of the school, of the society, of friends, of books, of particular incidents, of accidental meetings, of casual occupations, of innumerable other disposing circumstances. A man may be very truthful, but struggling as yet with accidental error, and clouded with the medium in which he happens to live, or he may, unawares, have adopted arguments or expressions which are far from doing justice to his character and sentiments. Now, if there ever was a man of whom this was probable, it is Dr. Hampden. His friends are constantly reminding us that he has not written, either before or since, anything like his Bampton Lectures, and the two or three lesser publications which followed immediately in the wake of that celebrated volume. That itself proves that he could now bestow upon his work that nine years' castigation recommended by the Roman critic, without any very serious sacrifice of his theological identity and credit.

'In point of fact Dr. Hampden wrote those lectures under very peculiar stimulus, suggestion, and aid. We very much question whether they can correctly be called his own. As far as regards the selection of the subject, the mode in which it is treated, the authors used and worked into the text, the scrutiny applied to the creeds and other formularies of the Church, and, above all, the tendency of the work, it has more claim to be considered Mr. Blanco White's than Dr. Hampden's. During the latter end of 1831 and the early part of 1832—that is, for eight or nine months preceding the delivery of the lectures—Dr. Hampden was a frequent, it was said at the time an almost daily, visitor at the lodgings of that singular and most interesting person. It so happened that both had become very much separated from the college of which they were members. The gulf of controversy which afterwards so fearfully expanded then already yawned. Indeed, controversy was at an end between poor Mr. Blanco White and the leading members of the common room of his college. They too well understood one another's position. Illness, nervousness, bodily and mental torture, nourished by a strange mixture of harrowing self-scrutinies and petty vexations of a less dignified character, kept that amiable and most unfortunate gentleman for many months a prisoner to his room. Dr. Whately went to Dublin in October 1831, taking with him Dr. Hinds, and breaking up the bright little circle of which he was the sun, if a character so eccentric can be associated with ideas of unity and order. Mr. Blanco White was then solitary indeed, as the few who relieved his solitude well knew.

'Dr. Hampden was one of them. He had attached himself to what used to be called the Oriel School, before it was eclipsed by a more serious and extensive development. It is natural to suppose, that he did not feel that positive antipathy to poor Blanco White's speculations, and that slender respect for his critical and philosophical acumen, which by this time prevailed in that college. He felt a qualified confidence in his guide. When the tendency and inner meaning of Mr. Blanco White's conversation had long been evident, even to the most youthful of his acquaintance, it is difficult to suppose that Dr. Hampden did not see the precipice on which he was treading. Indeed, it subsequently appeared from Mr. Blanco White's own strictures on the result, that Dr. Hampden must have been frequently conscious of a point at which he and his Gamaliel could no longer keep company. Dr. Hampden, probably saw in Mr. Blanco White what others saw too clearly—a mind shaken, unhinged, perplexed, wounded, never to be healed; subject to violent reactions; indignant at all tyranny of opinion and carried to extremes of resistance, and even of retaliation, where liberty of conscience was concerned. He probably found, that he derived the most valuable assistance from these colloquies, and trusted that, in the composition of his lectures, he could make all the proper deductions for Mr. Blanco White's excesses of opinion, of expression, or of temper. It was natural, at least, that he should make the attempt.

'When the course of lectures had been preached, and at length published, it was obvious at once to all who had been familiar with Mr. Blanco White's conversation, that one was only a version of the other. The subjects, the theories, the key words, the books, the very passages were common to the lecturer and the talker. It was evident to several individuals, that what Mr. Blanco White had been frequently urging them to take in hand, Dr. Hampden had at length the industry, the resolution, or the courage to essay. They recognised at once that attempt to apply the Baconian induction to the "scriptural fact," in which poor Mr. Blanco White had long been floundering. They recognised the very letter of the arguments and illustrations urged by Mr. Blanco White against the definitions, distinctions, and conclusions of the schools. That gentleman had some time before undertaken for the 'Theological Library,' a 'History of the Inquisition,' which he had early developed into a history of religious dogmatism from the Apostolic age. We possess the fruits of his labours in his 'Observations on Heresy and Orthodoxy.' Some time before this he had also determined to publish a translation of Aristotle's 'Organon,' with notes and illustrations from the human mind, and from the ancient and mediæval modes of thought. Before 1832 he had completed his notes; or, at least, had written as much matter as it would be expedient to publish. The translation, however, flagged. Neither has appeared that we know of. Not long after this he actually published 'The Law of Anti-Religious Libel Re-considered.' These works we mention to account for the peculiar turn of Mr. Blanco White's reading and speculations in 1831—1832. He had also been reading with enthusiasm, and urging upon his visitors, 'Guizot's History,' and Victor Cousin; of both of whom, as also other French writers, numerous traces appear in the lectures.

'While the lectures were in hand, and these confabulations were in progress, Mr. Blanco White frequently alluded to them with considerable excitement as the steps to a great disclosure that would astonish the University. He became nervous, indeed, at the probable recoil of the attempt, but entertained no doubt that a great advance would be made to the overthrow of religious dogmatism. After the delivery of the lectures, he expressed considerable disappointment, and instanced places in the discussion where the lecturer "stopped." His words were—"Dr. Hampden is a rising man, and cannot afford to go farther." There is, however, no reason to believe that Dr. Hampden had ever given him real grounds to expect that he would "go farther;" and poor Mr. Blanco White was not unlikely to feel somewhat aggrieved at finding his labours neither openly recognised nor thoroughly effectuated. Those were his expressions, and their tone was not respectful or friendly to Dr. Hampden, though, when the latter became the subject of a theological "persecution," he felt unqualified interest in the fortunes of his temporary pupil.

'These lectures we believe to be as much the products of Mr. Blanco White's mind as certain works penned by Xenophon and Plato are virtually the thoughts of Socrates. There is, indeed, a considerable difference of style between the lectures and Mr. Blanco White's published works even on the same subjects; but they who were acquainted with that extraordinary person will remember that he talked and wrote very differently. He spoke with vigour and terseness, and with his eye upon his subject. When he

> took up his pen, however, he became immediately surrounded and enfeebled by the gloomy shades of his mental experience, and his many sore grievances with the world. We entertain no doubt that a critical comparison of the Bampton Lectures with Mr. Blanco White's subsequent publications and posthumous Remains will be found to bear out the above statement.
>
> 'The lectures were written in 1831-32. Mr. Blanco White, in his published account of his mental history, says, that from 1829 to the publication of his 'Heresy and Orthodoxy,' in 1835, in which he finally renounced the Trinitarian doctrine, his creed was a "modification of the Sabellian theory," which he explains and pronounces to be a "devout contrivance" that will not bear examination. He discovered that his faith had been *really* "Unitarianism disguised in words." He subsequently became a Deist, and an anxious, devout, inquiring, and most miserable Deist, he died.
>
> 'Now, we submit to Dr. Hampden himself, whether these facts do not both require an explanation on his part, and also facilitate it. What is easier than to point out for the benefit of those who may not possess Dr. Hampden's powers of "stopping" in time where he has been led too far by his treacherous guide, where he should have "stopped" rather earlier, where the ground is dangerous, where an argument is presumptuous, or an expression irreverent? By doing this he will neutralize the mischief he may have done, and may still do, and also put a favourable conclusion to this most painful controversy.'

Dr. Hampden in his letter next takes occasion to call attention to his 'devoted service in the ministry of the Gospel for more than a quarter of a century.' He then thinks proper to parallel himself with 'the apostles themselves, following their Lord 'in his persecutions, who were reviled and evil-entreated by 'their brethren.' Also he informs us, that Bull and Hooker suffered under misrepresentations; and enthymematically suggests that he is a persecuted believer also. And finally, that his class was not deserted, nor himself hissed when ascending the pulpit of Christ Church: which assurances, together with the impregnable fact that 'thousands have heard his Sermons and his Lectures,' we leave in all their modest majesty to speak for themselves, in company with Lord John Russell's gratifying notification, that 'he has preached sermons, for 'which he has been honoured with the approbation of several 'prelates of our Church;' a fact which could only have been extorted from the hesitating and coy confession of the preacher himself.

Into the last division of Dr. Hampden's defence it is simply annoying to follow him. His opponents are infected with 'the jealousies and heart-burnings of the polemical spirit,' they habitually violate the ninth commandment—their objections arise from 'the corrupt human heart, a warrant for any excess of uncharitableness and even for untruths.' Their charges are 'base,' and 'calumny;' his 'adversaries are reckless,' 'prejudiced,' guilty of 'misrepresentation,' and 'perversion;' are 'artful,' 'hostile and uncandid,' 'cruel,' 'sophistical;' they resort to 'false colouring;' they are 'dishonest,' 'invidious,' and act from 'animosity,' and are guilty of 'wrong;' they are 'anonymous slanderers in newspapers.' And all this he can say while 'appealing to the All-Seeing God, who tries the heart.' Now the office of a Bishop is, to 'maintain and set forward quietness, love, and peace, among all men.' This *florilegium maledictionis*, may well speak for itself: we have allowed Dr. Hampden to be his own portrait-painter; he has projected his own image: he has supplied his own illumination and attitude: and there is no likeness so severely faithful as that of the photograph.

But there are some omissions in this letter to which we must in justice advert. First, there is not a word of retractation—not a word of regret, that through his unfortunate style the peace of the Church has been disturbed—not a syllable of sympathy for those who were likely to incur loss of worldly goods for a conscientious suspicion of the soundness of his writings. No, Dr. Merewether's 'corrupt human heart' has led him to risk shipwreck of peace and family duties, and the noble work of rebuilding his cathedral—possibly to forego station and honour, even the very means of life—for the sake of indulging, we suppose, in 'base calumny' and 'reckless prejudice.' Why—we earnestly ask,—does Dr. Hampden now maintain his sullen silence? Why does he cling to the promotion which he knows can never be completed, if completed at all, without such a mass of complicated suffering and distress, and contumely, and rebuke and blasphemy, separation and sin, as would make the very coldest heart uneasy and melancholy in contemplating it? Where is the conscience—where is the self-denial, where the patient suffering, which can behold all this unmoved and unappealing? Could not Dr. Hampden himself have some considerafor this? Does he delight in forecasting the chains which are to be riveted for the Church? Does the ring of anvil and forge in his ears please him? and, so long as he mounts the throne, is he indifferent to peace?

To conclude: the Oxford censure was 'an unworthy proceeding'—Dr. Hampden is not 'under the censure of the University'—it is 'an illegal measure.'[1] Not only does he know, none more accurately, that the particular form of the *privilegium* was submitted to by its promoters, and was actually planned by his personal associates and friends, only in, mistaken we fear, deference to his own feelings, and with a laxity, yet tenderness, of expression of which he now adroitly avails himself, but which was then hoped might alleviate the pain which it could not but inflict: but yet more, he knows that the first impulse of an honourable and generous heart when labouring under an unfounded imputation is instantly to have the case decided by law. The law is open: has he ever named the *venue*—has he challenged a 'legal' measure? in what way would he like the University to express a worthy judgment—or, if he has all along thought its judgment in any form illegal, courts of law would have condemned it—has he appealed to the Queen in her courts of Westminster? He appealed to the Archbishop, and when that prelate's judgment, in a published correspondence, was declared against him, did he reply in other terms than those scarcely short of rebuke? If Dr. Hampden has been illegally judged, what steps has he taken to set the judgment aside? Once, indeed, he appealed to the very tribunal which condemned him, thereby admitting its competency, and he only gained a repetition of it. While many premiers have promoted many Bishops *un*qualified, and while Lord John Russell has the distinction of having selected the only man in England who was *dis*qualified, it would have been more dignified and worthy of his responsible station to have compelled his nominee to prove that such disqualification—which while it remains unreversed is a fact—was illegal. A verdict is not undone by railing at it, and calling the judge and jury knaves and fools; but it can always be set aside by a new trial, or a Court of Error.

---

[1] Thomassin, tom. ii. p. 648 (of the French edition), considers universities as founded by Bishops; and he especially instances the University of Paris, which he regards as the model and type of all Universities; and therefore he concludes that theological censures belong to them in right of their constitution. Du Boulay (Bulæus), who wrote the 'History of the University of Paris,' gives instances of the exercise of this right. Antony à Wood mentions several Oxford condemnations of the Lollards, and says that the Pope gave the University power to *license preachers.* The famous Oxford Decree is well known. Another case is remarkably parallel to Dr. Hampden's. Arthur Bury was Prebendary of Exeter, Rector

And here, as far as Dr. Hampden is concerned, this history must leave him, with the fact that the election at Hereford is not canonically completed, and cannot be confirmed in the Archbishop's Court. The case itself is beginning to be understood: Dr. Hampden himself has long since been understood: and the noble conduct of Dean Merewether and Canon Huntingford, and the lustre which such a manly conscientious deed sheds upon the whole Church, is even now candidly and honestly owned by portions of the daily press which have been hitherto among Dr. Hampden's most strenuous supporters. There can be but one opinion both of that act and of the final issue of a cause of

---

of Exeter College, and King's Chaplain, in 1665. During the time (1690) that he was Pro-Vice-Chancellor, he printed, under that authority, a Socinian book, called the 'Naked Gospel.' For this publication, he was ejected from Exeter College, and his book was burned at Oxford, by order of Convocation.

which it forms the most distinguished event: and that is, at the very lowest, a most hopeful and an encouraging one.

These great struggles tell a high lesson of faith and patience. Commenced simply under an intolerable and burning sense of painful yet imperious duty, with only a partial and immediate application, they must end, if pursued in singleness and sincerity of heart, in good issues. Who could have thought that such high and enthusiastic displays of feeling, as we have lately had, could have been elicited by one dull mischievous book? We get into fixed habits of thought and assumption—cold and ungenerous ones—that our actual modes and forms of constriction and conventionalities are tied down by some iron necessity—that nothing can break through the hard system of centuries. And then a single act of duty breaks the fatal spell—the world of unrealities, and sophistries, and make-shifts, is disenchanted, and high thoughts come into the Church's mind. And these things, now as ever, tell upon the world and win even its reluctant applause; and the Church's inner life comes out; and the cold mist of apathy lifts, and the bright blue heavens and sharp mountain peaks of progress are disclosed. Such is the might and mystery of duty and self-sacrifice. Deeds of duty cannot be explained away; few try to do it; none succeed in such a misrepresentation. Even now it may be that complete success will not crown the present events: a compromise may ensue: modifications, not a break up, of the system are to be immediately expected, or are to be wished for. Old feelings and stages of thought must die out: they are at present moribund and tottering, but not dead. And yet the real substantial victory is ours: hearts are strengthened—calumny and misunderstanding are put to silence. Our position is decided. We know Whose we are, and Who is with us. It is by protests, struggles, hoping against hope, by resolute endurance, by winning even a single difficult post and maintaining it, that its triumphs of faith are achieved by the Church. In the thrilling heart, and kindling eye, and burning words of confidence and hope in friends are to be sought the substantial fruits of toil. And if these are already ours—as who shall deny?—the ingathering of the harvest of which such are the first-fruits, may be left to other hands to garner: and for all the disappointments, and disasters, and checks, and downcast thoughts of the past we may well consent to be thankful.

APPENDIX.

I.—PROTEST OF THE BISHOPS.

'My Lord,—We, the undersigned Bishops of the Church of England, feel it our duty to represent to your Lordship, as head of her Majesty's Government, the apprehension and alarm which have been excited in the minds of the Clergy by the rumoured nomination to the See of Hereford of Dr. Hampden, in the soundness of whose doctrine the University of Oxford has affirmed, by a solemn decree, its want of confidence.

'We are persuaded that your Lordship does not know how deep and general a feeling prevails on this subject; and we consider ourselves to be acting only in the discharge of our bounden duty, both to the Crown and to the Church, when we respectfully but earnestly express to your Lordship our conviction that, if this appointment be completed, there is the greatest danger both of the interruption of the peace of the Church, and of the disturbance of the confidence which it is most desirable that the Clergy and laity of the Church should feel in every exercise of the Royal Supremacy, especially as regards that very delicate and important particular, the nomination to vacant Sees.

'We have the honour to be, my Lord,
'Your Lordship's obedient faithful Servants,

'C. J. LONDON,
C. WINTON,
J. LINCOLN,
CHR. BANGOR.
HUGH CARLISLE,
G. ROCHESTER,
RICH. BATH AND WELLS,
J. H. GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL,
H. EXETER,
E. SARUM,
A. T. CHICHESTER,
T. ELY,
SAML. OXON.

'*To the Right Hon. the Lord John Russell,*
&c. &c. &c.

II.—LORD JOHN RUSSELL'S REPLY.

'Chesham Place, December 8th, 1847.

'My Lords,—I have the honour to receive a representation signed by your Lordships, on the subject of the nomination of Dr. Hampden to the See of Hereford.

'I observe that your Lordships do not state any want of confidence on your part in the soundness of Dr. Hampden's doctrine. Your Lordships refer me to a decree of the University of Oxford, passed eleven years ago, and founded upon lectures delivered fifteen years ago.

'Since the date of that decree, Dr. Hampden has acted as Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford, and many Bishops, as I am told, have required certificates of attendance on his lectures before they proceeded to ordain candidates who had received their education at Oxford. He has likewise preached sermons, for which he has been honoured with the approbation of several Prelates of our Church.

'Several months before I named Dr. Hampden to the Queen for the See of Hereford, I signified my intention to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and did not receive from him any discouragement.

'In these circumstances, it appears to me that should I withdraw my recommendation of Dr. Hampden, which has been sanctioned by the Queen, I should virtually assent to the doctrine, that a decree of the University of Oxford is a perpetual ban of exclusion against a Clergyman of eminent learning and irreproachable life, and that, in fact, the supremacy which is now by law vested in the Crown is to be transferred to a majority of the members of one of our Universities.

'Nor should it be forgotten, that many of the most prominent among that majority have since joined the communion of the Church of Rome.

'I deeply regret the feeling that is said to be common among the Clergy on this subject. But I cannot sacrifice the reputation of Dr. Hampden, the rights of the Crown, and what I believe to be the true interests of the Church, to a feeling which I believe to be founded on misapprehension and fomented by prejudice.

'At the same time I thank your Lordships for an interposition which I believe to be intended for the public benefit.

'I have, &c.
'J. Russell.'

'*To the Right Rev. the Bishop of London, Winchester, Lincoln, &c.*'

III.—Protest of the Laity.

'My Lord,—We, the undersigned Lay-Members of the Church of England, beg leave to represent to your Lordship the deep concern with which we have heard the report of your intention to recommend Dr. Hampden to Her Majesty as the future Bishop of Hereford.

'We have seen and heard enough of the strong feeling both of Laymen and of Clergy on this occasion, to convince us that the appointment, if persisted in, will stir up feelings of bitterness, which it would be impossible soon to eradicate, and which would probably lead to consequences which your Lordship would deprecate as earnestly as ourselves.

'We fervently hope that these, or other reasons, may induce your Lordship to reconsider the case, before you finally advise Her Majesty to recommend, for election to the vacant Bishopric, a person who has been solemnly pronounced by his own University to be unworthy of its confidence as a Teacher of Christian Truth. We are, My Lord,

'*To the Right Hon. Lord John Russell, M.P.*' '&c. &c.'

IV.—Lord John Russell's Reply.

'Chesham Place, December 10th, 1847.

'My Lords and Gentlemen,—I have had the honour to receive your representation on the subject of my recommendation of Dr. Hampden to the Queen, for the see of Hereford.

'I am aware that there exists a strong feeling on the part of some Laymen and Clergymen against Dr. Hampden; but that the appointment should excite feelings of bitterness, is, I hope an error, as it would show a sad want of Christian charity on the part of those who would indulge such feelings.

'The consequences with which I am threatened, I am prepared to encounter, as I believe the appointment will tend to strengthen the Protestant character of our Church, so seriously threatened of late by many defections to the Church of Rome. Among the chief of these defections are to be found the leading promoters of the movement against Dr. Hampden, eleven years ago, in the University of Oxford.

'I had hoped the conduct of Dr. Hampden, as Regius Professor of Divinity, and Head of a Theological Board at Oxford, had effaced the memory of that unworthy proceeding.

'I have the honour to be, my Lords and Gentlemen,
'Your obedient Servant,
'J. RUSSELL.'

'*To certain Lay-Members of the Church of England.*'

V.

'Palace, Ripon, Dec. 2, 1847.

'My dear Lord,—Although I do not feel myself at liberty to adopt all the expressions contained in the memorial about to be presented from several of my episcopal brethren to the head of her Majesty's Government on the subject of the rumoured nomination of the Rev. Dr. Hampden to the see of Hereford, I would, nevertheless, desire to join in most respectfully but earnestly expressing my conviction, that unless his lordship can be induced to pause before he presses on the election of Dr. Hampden, and to wait until some means be found of proving the groundlessness of those apprehensions which it has excited, there is the greatest danger of the further interruption of the peace of the Church, and of the disturbance of that confidence which it is most desirable that the clergy and the laity of the Church should feel in every exercise of the royal supremacy.

'Believe me, my dear Lord,
'Your very faithful friend and brother,
(Signed) 'C. T. RIPON.'

'*The Lord Bishop of London.*'

VI.—TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

'May it please your Majesty,—We, your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subject, John Merewether, Doctor in Divinity, Dean of the Cathedral Church of Hereford, most humbly lay before your Majesty the assurances of our deepest and most heartfelt attachment to your Majesty's sacred person and government.

'We thank your Majesty for having graciously granted to us your royal licence to elect a Bishop of our Church, in place of the Right Rev. Father in God Thomas, late Bishop thereof, and for "*requiring and commanding us, by the faith and allegiance by which we stand bound to your Majesty, that we elect* SUCH A PERSON AS MAY BE DEVOTED TO GOD, *and useful and faithful to your Majesty and your kingdom.*"

'We also duly recognise the goodness of your Majesty in accompanying this your royal licence with letters missive, graciously announcing to us that out of "*your princely disposition and zeal you are desirous,*" as we cannot doubt, "*to prefer unto the same See a person* MEET THEREUNTO."

'And we further acknowledge your Majesty's gracious intention towards us, in "NAMING and RECOMMENDING unto us" by the same letters missive, Dr. Renn Dickson Hampden, your Majesty's Reader in Theology in your University of Oxford, to be by us "ELECTED and CHOSEN unto the said Bishopric"

'But we most humbly beseech your Majesty to permit us, as in duty bound, and in obedience to your Majesty's gracious command touching the qualities of the person to be chosen by us, to represent (and, if it be deemed necessary, by sufficient documents to prove), that somewhat more than eleven years ago, the said Dr. Renn Dickson Hampden, then being the late King William's Reader of Theology, the said University did, as by its laws, rights, and privileges, and by the law of the land it is empowered, and on fit occasion bound to do, judge of the published writings of the said Dr. Hampden, and did solemnly decree, and by a statute in its House of Convocation duly made did enact that the said Dr. Hampden should be deprived of certain weighty functions, importing the right of judging of sound teaching and preaching of God's word, which had been specially annexed by former statutes of the said University to his office therein; to wit, "that he be in the number of those by whom are appointed the select preachers before the University,"—and, further, that his counsel be taken in case of any preacher being called (as by the statutes of the said University every preacher who may have delivered any unsound or suspected doctrine in any of his preachings is liable to be called) into question before the Vice-Chancellor.' And such deprivation of Dr. Hampden was expressly declared in the said statute to have been decreed, '*because in his said published writings he has so treated matters theological, that in this respect the University hath no confidence in him.*"

'Furthermore, six years afterwards the Convocation of the said University, having been called together to consider the question of the fitness of repealing the said statute, so that the said Dr. Hampden might be restored to the functions of which he had been as aforesaid deprived, the said Convocation did thereupon solemnly decree that the statute should not be repealed, but should still be (and, accordingly, it still continues to be) in full force and vigour; whereby the said Dr. Hampden stands to this day denounced by the judgment of the said University as "*devoid altogether of its confidence in matters theological, by the reason of the manner in which those matters have been treated by him in his published writings.*"

'And here we deem it our duty to your Majesty humbly to submit, that not only by the people and Church of England, but by all your Majesty's royal predecessors, the solemn decisions of either of your Majesty's Universities of Oxford and Cambridge on questions and matters of theology have always been deemed to carry with them very high authority, and that such is the renown of these your Majesty's famous Universities throughout the reformed portion of Christendom, that everywhere their judgment is heard with reverence and honour.

'Neither may we omit dutifully to lay before your Majesty, that to the office of a Bishop, to which we are commanded by your Majesty to choose "*a person meet to be elected,*" essentially adheres the duty of judging of the doctrine of the clergy committed to his charge, especially of those who are to be instituted or licensed by him to the cure of souls—which high duty the University of Oxford has decreed, as aforesaid, that Dr. Hampden is, in its judgment, unfit to have confided to him; the distressing and disastrous consequences which must be expected to result from placing the diocese of Hereford, by the strong hand of power, under a person so characterised by so high authority, we are as unwilling as it would be painful to recount.

'For all these reasons, and not least because, in common as we believe with almost every considerate Churchman, we are desirous and anxious that the prerogative of the Crown in nominating to bishoprics should be for ever established on its only firm foundation—the confidence of the Church in the wisdom, the justice, the purity, the considerate and conscientious moderation with which it is exercised—we most humbly pray your Majesty to name and recommend some other person whom your Majesty shall think meet to be elected by us for our Bishop, or that your Majesty will graciously relieve us from the necessity of proceeding to the election till you shall have been pleased to submit Dr. Renn Dickson Hampden's published writings (so judged as aforesaid by the Convocation of the University of Oxford) to the judgment either of the two Houses of Convocation of Clergy of the province of Canterbury which is now sitting, or of the Provincial

Council of Bishops of the same province, assisted by such divines as your Majesty or the said Provincial Council shall be pleased to call, or of some other competent tribunal which your Majesty shall be graciously pleased to appoint. In order whereunto we have appointed for the day of election the 28th day of December instant, being the eleventh day from the receipt of your Majesty's *Congé d'Elire*, and the last which we can lawfully appoint.

'And we are the more emboldened to lay this, our humble supplication, at the feet of your Majesty by your known cordial attachment to our holy and apostolic Church, and by your faithful and uniform observance of the oath made by your Majesty at your coronation—"That you will maintain and preserve to the utmost of your power the doctrine, discipline, and government thereof."

'And even if it could be imagined that these last-mentioned considerations apply not to our case, we should nevertheless confidently rely on your Majesty's experienced regard for that dearest and most sacred right of every class and description of your subjects, the right of liberty of conscience, and on your having at the head of your Majesty's councils a noble lord, the proudest boast of whose illustrious house, as well as of his own public life, it hitherto has been to assert that right for all men against all opponents—a right which would in our persons be trampled to the very dust if, in spite of all our just and reasonable reclamations, we be coerced under the threatened penalties of *præmunire* to elect for our Bishop a person whom we cannot conscientiously believe, so long as the aforesaid judgment stands against him, to be "meet to be elected" to that most holy office.

'In conclusion, we would add our fervent prayer, as well as our most earnest hope, that your Majesty may long be permitted by the King of kings to reign in the hearts of all your subjects the approved "Defender of the Faith," "ruling all estates and degrees of men amongst us, whether ecclesiastical or temporal," as is your sacred and undoubted right—giving alike to all experience of the blessings of your just and beneficent government, and receiving from all the willing homage of grateful and confiding love.

'In witness whereunto we have affixed our decanal seal this 17th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1847.'

(L. S.)

VII.—SIR GEORGE GREY'S ACKNOWLEDGMENT.

'Whitehall, Dec. 20, 1847.

'Sir,—Lord John Russell having placed in my hands the petition addressed by you to her Majesty, and transmitted in your letter to him of the 17th instant,

'I have had the honour to lay the same before the Queen, and I am to inform you that her Majesty has not been pleased to issue any commands thereupon. 'I have, &c. 'G. GREY.

'*The Very Rev. the Dean of Hereford.*'

VIII.—DEAN MEREWETHER'S LETTER TO LORD JOHN RUSSELL.

'My Lord,—I have had the honour to receive your lordship's letter, announcing that you had received my memorial to the Queen, and that you had transmitted it to Sir G. Grey for presentation to her Majesty; and by the same post I also receive the information that Sir G. Grey had laid the same before the Queen, and that "he was to inform me that her Majesty had not been pleased to issue any commands thereupon." Under these circumstances I feel compelled once more to trouble your lordship with a few remarks.

'Throughout the correspondence in which I have had the honour to be engaged with your lordship, as well as in the interview which you were pleased to afford me on the subject of the appointment to the See of Hereford, it has been my object frankly and faithfully to declare to you the facts which have come to my knowledge, and the honest conviction of my mind. I desire still to act upon the same principle, and to submit to your lordship finally, and as briefly as possible, the following considerations, upon which I feel constrained to adopt a course which, however I may apprehend it will not be entirely congenial to your lordship's wishes, will, under circumstances in which I am placed, obtain from your lordship's candour the admission that it is the only course which I could pursue.

'I crave your lordship's indulgence whilst I enumerate the especial obligations to which I am bound, and I state them in the order of their occurrence.

'When matriculated to the University of Oxford, of which I am still a member, the following oath was administered to me, as well as on taking each of my degrees:—"Tu dabis fidem ad observandum omnia statuta, privilegia, et consuetudines hujus Universitatis; ita Deus te adjuvet tactis sacrosanctis Christi Evangeliis."

'Again—when I was admitted to the sacred orders of priest in the church of God, a part of my ordination vow was expressed in these words—that I would "banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's word."

'Again—when I was inducted, on occasion of the installation to the office which I hold in the cathedral church of Hereford, as I stepped over the threshold of the fabric, the restoration of which, for the due honour of Almighty God, it has been my pride and anxious endeavour to promote, I was required to charge my soul with this responsibility:—"Ego, Joannes Merewether, Decanus Herefordensis, ab hâc horâ in antea, fidelis ero huic sacrosanctæ Herefordensi ecclesiæ, necnon jura, libertates, privilegia, et consuetudines ejusdem, pro viribus observabo et ea manutenebo et defendam pro posse meo; sic me Deus adjuvet, et hæc sancta Evangelia."

'My lord, I cannot divest my mind of the awful sense of the stringency of those engagements at the present exigency. Let me entreat your lordship's patience whilst I endeavour to explain my apprehension of them.

'In my letter of the 1st of December, in reply to the second which your lordship was pleased to address to me—and which correspondence I trust your lordship will permit me publicly to refer to, in vindication of my conduct, should need require it—I observed, "In regard to Dr. Hampden's tenets, I would abstain from any opinion upon them till I have again fairly and attentively read his writings." That act of justice I have carefully performed, and I will add with an earnest desire to discover grounds upon which, in case of Dr. Hampden's ever occupying the high station for which he has been selected by your lordship, my mind might be relieved from all distrust, and I might be enabled as cordially as possible to render that service which the relative duties of diocesan and dean and chapter involve.

'It is painful in the extreme to feel obliged to declare that I discover in those writings many *assertions*—not merely references to theories or impressions of others—but *assertions*, which to my calm and deliberate appreciation appear to be heterodoxical, I believe I may say heretical, and very, very much, which is most dangerous, most objectionable, calculated to weaken the hold which the religion we possess as yet obtains, and ought to obtain always, upon the minds of its professors. I feel certain that the perusal of several of these works by any of that class who, "by reason of use" (in cautious examination of such productions) "have not their senses exercised to discern both good and evil," would produce a doubt and distrust in the teaching of our Church—in her creeds—her formularies—her liturgy; would rob them of the inestimable joy and peace in believing, and be highly detrimental to the spread of true religion.

'Such being my conviction, I would ask your lordship how it must affect my conscience in reference to those solemn obligations which I have already detailed? I have sworn that I will observe all the statutes of the University of which I am still a member. The statute of that University touching this matter stands in the following words, at this moment uncancelled, unrepealed:—"Quin ab universitate commissum fuerit, S. Theologiæ Professori Regio, ut unus sit ex eorum numero a quibus designantur selecti concionatores, secundum Tit. XVI., 58 (Addend. p. 150), necnon ut ejus concilium ad hibeatur si quis concionator coram Vice-Cancellario in questionem vacatur, secundum Tit. XVI. s. 11 (Addend. p. 151), quum vero qui nunc Professor, et *scriptis suis publici juris factis, ita res theologicas tractaverit, et in hac parte nullam ejus duciam habeat Universitas;* statutum est, quod munerum prædictorum expers sit S. Theologiæ Professor Regius, donec aliter Universitati placuerit, ne vero quid detrimenti capiat interea Universitas, Professoris ejusdem vicibus fungantur alii, scilicet, in concionatores selectos designando senior inter Vice-Cancellarii deputatos, vel eo absente, aut ipsius Vice-Cancellarii locum tenente, proximus ex omine deputatus (proviso semper quod sacros ordines succeperit) et in concilio de concionibus habendo, Prælector Dominæ Margarettæ Comitissæ Richmondiæ." Should I not be guilty of deliberate perjury, if, in direct defiance of such a decree, I did any act which should place the object of it in such a position as to be not only the judge of the soundness of the theological opinions and preaching of a whole diocese, but of those whom, from time to time, he must admit to cure of souls, and even to the sacred orders of the ministry?

'I have sworn, at the most awful moment of my life, that I will "banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's word." It may be replied, that this engagement applies to the ministrations in the cure of souls, inherent only in parochial functions; but the statutes of our cathedral church constitute me one of the guardians of the soundness of the doctrine which may be preached in that sacred edifice:—"Si quid a quopiam pro concione proferatur, quod cum verbo Dei, articulis Religionis, aut Liturgiæ Anglicanæ consentire non videtur, eâ de re, Decanus atque Residentiarii, quod quot audierint, Dominum Episcopum sine morâ per literas suas monebunt." With what confidence, or what hope of the desired end, should I communicate such a case to a bishop whose own soundness of theological soundness was more than suspected? Should I not be guilty of a breach of my ordination vows if I did not protest against the admission of such a person to such a responsible post, and endeavour to "banish and drive away," by all lawful means, that person of the 18,000 clergy of this land on whom the censure and deprivation of one of the most learned and renowned seminaries of religious teaching in the world is yet in its full operation and effect, one who is already designated thereby as a setter forth of erroneous and strange doctrines? Again, I have sworn to be FAITHFUL to the cathedral church of Hereford. Faithful I could not be, either as to the maintenance of the doctrine, or the discipline of the Church in those respects already alluded to, or the welfare and unity of that Church, either in the cathedral body itself or in the diocese at large, under existing circumstances, if by any act of mine I promoted Dr. Hampden's elevation to the episcopal throne of that church and diocese. Faithful I have laboured to be in the restoration and the saving of its material and venerable fabric. Faithful, by God's help, I will strive to be, in obtaining for it that oblation of sound and holy doctrine which should ascend, together with the incense of prayer and praise, "in the beauty of holiness," untainted and unalloyed by any tincture of "philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ."

'But your lordship may rely, there is another oath by which I have bound myself, which I have as yet overlooked; not so, my lord. Of my sentiments on the royal prerogative I have already put your Lordship in possession. When I warned you of the consequences of your appointment, of the tendency which it would produce to weaken the existing relations between Church and State, I fully recognised the just prerogative of the Crown; and when I thought I had not sufficiently dwelt upon it, I wrote a second time to make myself distinctly understood.

Nor is it only the sense of legal obligation which would constrain me to a dutiful regard to such observance. Few men have a greater cause to feel their duty in this respect, warmed by the sense of kindness and condescension from those of royal station, than myself. The memory of one who anxiously contemplated the future happiness and *true* glory of his successor, fixed indelibly those sentiments upon my heart. And, if for his sake only, who could to a long course of almost parental kindness add, in an affecting injunction, the expression of his wishes for my good upon his death-bed, I should never be found forgetful—even although I may never have taken in the present reign the oath of allegiance—of that loyalty and devotion to my Sovereign which is not less a duty of religion than the grateful and constitutional homage of an English heart. Forgive me, my lord, for the reflection on that death-bed injunction, if I say, that had it been observed—as but for political and party influences it would have been —your lordship, the Church, and the nation, would have been spared this most unhappy trial, the results of which, as I have already again and again foreboded to your lordship, it is impossible to foresee. Nor, under any circumstances, is it likely that the obligation of the oath of allegiance in my person will be infringed upon; its terms are, that "I will be faithful and bear *true* allegiance;" and, accordingly, the *Congé d'Elire* has these expressions, "requiring and commanding you, by the faith and allegiance by which you stand bound to us, to elect such a person for your bishop and pastor as may *be devoted to God*, and USEFUL *and faithful to us* and *our* KINGDOM." Would it be any proof of fidelity or *true* allegiance, my lord, to elect a person as "MEET TO BE ELECTED" who was the contrary to those requirements? And can it be possible that in the *course of the Divine service* in the *Chief Sanctuary of Almighty God* in the diocese, however *named* and *recommended*, a person should be "UNANIMOUSLY CHOSEN *and* ELECTED" in the awful falsification of these words, IN THE PRESENCE OF GOD, *against the consciences of the unhappy* electors, simply because the adviser of the Crown (for "the Crown can do no wrong") has, in his shortsightedness and ignorance of facts (to say the least), thought fit to name an objectionable person, the one of all the clergy of the land so disqualified; and, when warned of the consequences by the voices of the Primate, of thirteen bishops, and hosts of priests and deacons, clergy and laity by hundreds, of all shades of opinions in the Church, persisted in the reckless determination.

'In the words of an eminent writer of our Church, "All power is given unto edification, none to the overthrow and destruction of the Church"—*Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity*, book viii. chap. 7; and the matter is, perhaps, placed in the true light and position by the learned author of *Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*—Francis Mason; the whole of which is well worthy of your lordship's notice. I venture to supply a brief extract, book iv. chap 13, 1625:—

'"*Philodoxus.*—You pretended to treat of Kings electing Bishops, and conferring of bishoprics, and now you ascribe not the election to Kings, but to the clergy, and claim only nomination for Kings?

'"*Orthodoxus.*—The King's nomination is, with us, a fair beginning to the election. Therefore, when he nominates any person to elect him, and gives, as I may say, the first vote for him.

'" *Philodoxus.*—What kind of elections are those of your deans and chapters? 'Tis certain they can't be called free elections, since nothing is to be done without the King's previous authority.

'" *Orthodoxus.*—The freedom of election doth not exclude the King's sacred authority, but *force and tyranny* only. If any unworthy person should be forced upon them against their will, or the clergy should be constrained to give their voices by force and threatening, such an election cannot be said to be free. But if the King do nominate a worthy person according to the laws, as our Kings have used to do, and give them authority to choose him, there is no reason why this may not be called a free election; for here is no force or violence used.

'" *Philodoxus.*—But if the King, deceived by *undeserved recommendations,* should happen to propose to the clergy a person unlearned, or of ill morals, or otherwise manifestly unworthy of that function, what's to be done then?

'" *Orthodoxus.*—Our Kings are wont to proceed in these cases maturely and cautiously, I mean with the utmost care and prudence; and hence it comes to pass that the Church of England is at this time in such a flourishing condition.

'" *Philodoxus.*—Since they are but men they are liable to human weakness; and, therefore, what's to be done if such a case should happen?

'" *Orthodoxus.*—If the electors could make sufficient proof of such crimes or incapacities, I think it were becoming them *to represent the same to the King, with all due humility, modesty, and duty, humbly* beseeching his Majesty, out of his own clemency, to take care of the interest of the widowed Church; and our Princes are so famous for their piety and condescension, that I doubt not that his Majesty would graciously answer their pious petition—and nominate another unexceptionable person, agreeable to all their wishes. Thus a mutual affection would be kept up between the bishop and his church."

'Nor is this a mere supposition, but there are instances in the history of this kingdom of such judicious reconsideration of an undesirable appointment. I will cite but one from Burnet's 'History of his own Times,' A.D. 1693, vol. iv. p. 289. London, 1733:—

'" The state of Ireland leads me to insert here a very particular instance of the Queen's pious care in disposing of bishoprics. Lord Sidney was so far engaged in the interest of a great family in Ireland, that he was too easily wrought on to recommend a branch of it to a vacant see. The representation was made with an undue character of the person; so the Queen granted it. But when she understood that he lay under a very bad character, she wrote a letter in her own hand to Lord Sidney, letting him know what she had heard, and ordered him to call for six Irish Bishops, whom she named to him, and to require them to certify to her their opinion of that person. They all agreed that he laboured under an ill-fame, and till that was examined they did not think it proper to promote him; so that matter was let fall. I do not name the person, for I intend not to leave a blemish on him, but set this down as an example fit to be imitated by Christian Princes."

'But, alas! remonstrance seems unheeded, and if our venerable Primate and thirteen Bishops have raised their united voice of warning and entreaty to no purpose, it is no marvel that my humble supplication should have pleaded in vain, for time—for investigation—for some regard to our consciences—some consideration for our painful and delicate position.

'The time draws near—on Tuesday next the *semblance* of an election is to be exhibited. I venture to assure your lordship that I could not undertake to say that it would be an unanimous election; I was bold enough to affirm that it would not be unanimous; and I, in my turn, received the intimation and the caution, I will not say *the threat*—that the law must be vindicated. Already have I assured your lordship that the principle on which this painful affair is regarded, is that of the most solemn religious responsibility; thousands regard it in this light. I have already told you, my lord, that the watchword of such is this—"Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye." I have anxiously implored your lordship to pause—to avert the blow. I have long since told you the truth. I have endeavoured to prevent, by every means in my power, the commotion which has arisen, and the necessity of the performance of a painful duty. I hoped the *Congé d'Elire* would not be issued *until a fair inquiry and investigation had been instituted.* A suit has been commenced in the ecclesiastical courts—why not have awaited its issue? When the *Congé d'Elire* did appear, I at once presumed, humbly but faithfully, though I stood alone, to petition the Crown; and now, when I am officially informed that "her Majesty has not been pleased to issue any commands thereupon," I feel it to be my bounden duty, after a full and calm deliberation on the whole subject, having counted the cost, but remembering the words of Him whose most unworthy servant I am—"He that loveth houses or lands more than me is not worthy of me"—loving my children dearly, and ardently desiring to complete the noble work which I have for seven years laboured to promote, yet not forgetting that there is "an hour of death and a day of judgment," when I trust, through the merits of my Redeemer, to be allowed to look up with hope, that I may be considered by the intercessions of mercy and pity to have been faithful in the hour of trial, to have "fought the good fight, to have kept the faith, to have finished *my* course,"—believing that I risk much, and shall incur your lordship's heavy displeasure, who may, if you will, direct the sword of power against me and mine—being certain that I preclude myself from that which might otherwise have been my lot, and expecting that I shall bring down upon myself the abuse and blame of some—I say, my lord, having fully counted the cost, having weighed *the sense of bounden duty* in the one scale against the consequences in the other, I have come to the deliberate resolve, that on Tuesday next no earthly consideration shall induce me to give my vote in the chapter of Hereford cathedral for Dr. Hampden's elevation to the See of Hereford.

'I have the honour to be, my Lord,
'Your Lordship's faithful humble servant,
'JOHN MEREWETHER, Dean of Hereford.

'*Hereford, Dec.* 22.'

IX.—LORD JOHN RUSSELL'S REPLY.

'Woburn Abbey, December 25.

'Sir,—I have had the honour to receive your letter of the 22d inst., in which you intimate to me your intention of violating the law.

'I have the honour to be your obedient servant,
'J. RUSSELL.

'*The Very Rev. the Dean of Hereford.*'

NOTICES.

THE Spottiswood Society has just completed the first part of Bishop Forbes's 'Considerationes Modestæ et Pacificæ Controversiarum de Justificatione, Purgatorio, Invocatione Sanctorum et Christo Mediatore, Eucharistiæ,' &c. The Latin text is accompanied by a translation into English, very carefully executed, and the numerous references are verified and completed in a manner almost as creditable to the patience of the Editor as his threading the mazes of Bellarmine, Paræus, and fifty other laborious controversialists, is to that of the writer. The present volume only extends to the first three books: 1. of justifying faith, 2. of the formal cause of justification, 3. on the questions of the uncertainty, mutability, and inequality of justice (the justified state). It would be premature to review the work until at least the whole subject of justification is completed; but there is matter in the present volume to occupy an ordinary thinker in mastering it at least until the next comes out. The views of numerous writers are stated and balanced with wonderful accuracy, and each is referred to his own point of view with a fairness rarely to be met with. In short, any one who wishes to know what has been thought and said on this great and difficult controversy, can do no better than consult Bishop Forbes, who has waded through the whole of it, and marked almost every point that is worthy of attention. Nor are his labours superseded by later controversial writings on the subject. They may help the reader to a more speedy decision of controverted points, and mark out a more single line of thought, but they will not equally answer the purpose of enabling him to understand various writers, and to separate the true from the false in their statements. Some may think this scarce worth while, at least as regards the 'more rigid Protestants;' and yet our view of the course of faith, and the merciful dealing of God, with our weak and prejudiced understandings, must always be very incomplete if we will not condescend to such investigations. And, perhaps, it may be said that most minds have some shreds of prejudice clinging to them which would be better cleared away by the discovery of their origin than blindly swept off by the adoption of a wholly new way of thinking.

'A Systematic Analysis of Bishop Butler's Treatise on Analogy.' By John Wilkinson, B.A., of Merton College, Oxford, Curate of Exmouth. (Oxford, Parker.) Framed upon an excellent model, and apparently very ably carried out, so as to present the reader with each of the great philosopher's reasonings, in a distinct form, together with what is too often omitted in works of this sort, its place in the main body of the argument. The only desideratum which we could feel,—one, however, which perhaps we have no right to expect from the analysis before us,—is that a greater perspicuity of style should be attempted, even at the cost of departure sometimes from the author's own modes of expressing himself, which, it is impossible to deny, are not always the most happily chosen for the conveyance of his ideas, however natural, viewed as exponents of the particular process by which this great work was elaborated.

Perhaps the most important book of the quarter is Mr. Keble's volume, 'Sermons Academical and Occasional.' (J. H. Parker.) They range over a quarter of a century: and, which can be said probably of no other living theological writer—they are uniform. The author's mind certainly has grown and expanded; but this growth implies a succession and enlargement, not a change. The particular charm about them is their even, smooth, soothing character. They breathe quite an atmosphere of calm. Dignity, however, and the consciousness of power, are implied in their character: it is the still, unruffled character of conviction and of an intense hold and living upon truth. We attach too ordinarily the notion of weakness to calm. Mr. Keble's is the calm of a settled tranquillity which arises after inquiry and conviction: some minds are tranquil only because apathetic or incapable. These sermons are a treasure, and fit for all time; while the Preface, 'On the present position of English Churchmen,' which has attracted most attention, has only a temporary or at least a local, however high, value. It is a careful and striking application of Bishop Butler's argument to the actual state and case of the Church of England: and of course takes, as the argument from analogy *must* take, the lowest ground. But while rhetorically the most doubtful, we all know that logically analogy is the most powerful weapon of the reasoning art. Still the argument from analogy, simply as a profound argument, is not fit for the popular reader; and, thankful as we are for everything which comes from Mr. Keble's pen, we may admit this. It is probably from such a feeling that we have heard people speak of this Preface as too apologetical, and that it ought to have taken, or rather added, some constructive argument in favour of the English Church. So to say only shows complete ignorance of the nature of Bishop Butler's argument, which can only be defensive: but it will serve to show that while the Sermons bear a very popular aspect, the Preface is more esoteric.

The Bishop of Exeter's brilliant letter on 'Scripture Readers,' (Murray,) has been effaced by his still more celebrated one on the Hampden case. We are disposed to take his Lordship's view: at the best all that Scripture Readers can do ordained Clergy can do better; and it is premature to try a new order till we have laboured to recruit the old force; and who shall say that anything like serious attempts to increase the Clergy have been made in responsible quarters? This single fact, together with the less than dubious parentage of the scheme, must be decisive.

A 'cabinet,' and slightly lopped, edition of 'Gulliver's Travels,' has appeared as a volume of one of Burns' series. It is a pretty book, and has some very clever woodcuts by Hablot Browne, the 'Phiz' of Dickens, &c. One of them, placed at p. 116, and lettered as the illustration of the voyage to Laputa, should have been at p. 140, to which in fact it refers.

'The Juvenile Englishman's Library,' (Masters,) has received additions, and judicious ones, in the shape of 'Stories from Froissart,' by Mr. Dunster, and an admirable volume, of great practical importance, from Mr. Neale, 'Stories from Heathen Mythology,' *for the use of Christian children.*

'The Adventures of a Fly,' and 'Simple Tales for the Young,' (Burns,) we find tell with those for whom they are written: the best test of value.

'Original Tales and Legends,' (Burns,) by Mr. W. B. Flower, has the same pious object as Mr. Neale's. To say that Mr. Flower has succeeded in a line so thoroughly his own as Mr. Neale's, is no slight praise.

'The Progress of the Church of England since the Reformation,' (Masters,) is an article reprinted from the 'Ecclesiastic,' which we admired at the time of publication, and welcome in this more permanent shape. It shows that we have constantly been drifting for three centuries since the Reformation: but that the tide has always swept in one, and that a more catholic, direction. The inference is obvious.

'Beauties of German Literature,' (Burns,) is a volume of the 'Select Library.' Heavy, we thought, but readable with an effort. Of the two schools, as in literature so in art, our affections are rather for the imaginative literature of Italy.

'Balaam and his Ass: a Poem,' (Houlston & Stoneman,) a vituperation of the Church of England by a Dissenter. Archbishop Laud observed of one who was guilty of a similar performance in which the same names occurred, that it 'displayed more of the ass than the prophet.'

A beautiful Edition of Watts's Hymns 'Divine and Moral Songs,' (Van Voorst,) has appeared sumptuously enriched with wooden block drawings by Cope, cut by Thompson. The artist, always pleasing, often inimitable, succeeds better in the quiet vignettes than in the more ambitious subjects. Compare the delightful little subject of p. 35 with the thin unsatisfactory group at p. 33, or with that at p. 88. The province of xylography is not the very highest, however important. The cuts are well worked by the printer, to whom is owing more than half the effect of this particular art. But what thin meagre stuff are the 'Songs' thus enshrined!

'History of the Hebrew Monarchy,' (Chapman,) is perhaps the most complete and plain-spoken attempt to force an indigenous rationalism on the English public, which has yet appeared. It is quite of the school of Ewald, written possibly with greater profanity. If there were not buyers for this class of books, such a series of them would not appear. We have already called attention to the fact, which every day makes more prominent, that a flood of practical, and, in a way, critical, and scholarly unbelief is setting in. The present writer, and with reason, suppresses his name.

The first volume of the Posthumous works of Dr. Chalmers, 'Daily Scripture Readings,' has been published by Mr. Constable, of Edinburgh. It is quite clear that they were never intended for, and are utterly unworthy of, publication. We can only attribute their appearance to some sordid purpose which does now and then appear in the religion established north of the Tweed.

Mr. W. G. Humphry, Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of London, has published a short 'Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles,' (J. W. Parker,) which is judicious and sound. It is quite eclectic in character, and incorporates the researches of the more respectable German commentators, such as

Olshausen. We observe that not only are S. Chrysostom and S. Augustine systematically shorn of their reverential prefix, but occasionally we hear of 'Paul' and 'Stephen,'—pp. 72, 73. Mr. Humphry we are quite sure does not intend this to be pointed; but however familiar the practice may be to students of foreign theology, 'Jerome' and 'Gregory' have a strange sound to English ears, and were never employed by the great English divines.

'Short Readings, Essays and Sermons,' by Mr. Woodward, of Fethard' (Hatchard,) are far above the run of 'Evangelical' writings; they show a grasp of literature, and largeness and fairness of view very satisfactory. The writer was a friend of Alexander Knox; and, with some of the peculiarities, has all the amiability of that remarkable person.

Mrs. Hamilton Gray's 'History of Rome for Young Persons,' (Hatchard,) is a very ingenious attempt to bring the recent discoveries of the critical school, into working competition with the miserable Goldsmiths and Pinnocks of our youth. Subsequent to each chapter is, what is called an after-chapter, on subjects literary, pictorial, topographical, or the like. We do not like this device ourselves; it seems alternating amusement and instruction on the beef-and-hard-dumpling plan. But it saves trouble, we suppose, to teachers and taught.

'A few words on Submission to the Catholic Church,' by a Recent Convert [Mr. Alexander Chirol]; 'Apostacy,' a Sermon, &c., by the Rev. W. J. E. Bennett (Cleaver); 'A Statement of Facts,' by Alexander Chirol, B.A. (Burns); 'A Reply to a Statement of Facts,' by Mr. Bennett (Cleaver); 'Remarks on Mr. Bennett's Reply to a Statement,' by Mr. Chirol (Burns); 'Conversion, a letter to Mr. Chirol,' by the Right Rev. N. Wiseman, D.D., &c. (Burns); 'Strictures on a Sermon entitled "Apostacy,"' by Caustic (T. W. Saunders); 'An Examination of Mr. Bennett's Theory,' by Mr. R. A. Gordon (Rivingtons); 'Some Account of the Reasons of my Conversion' [by Mr. John Gordon]; 'The Spirit of Romanism, a Sermon,' by Mr. Geo. Nugee (Cleaver). There: we believe this to be an accurate list of the various publications 'in reference to a late event at St. Paul's, Knightsbridge.' Mr. Alexander Chirol—apparently a person of small importance and very hazy judgment—Curate of St. Paul's, is 'converted' in the absence of the incumbent, Mr. Bennett. Mr. Bennett preaches a straightforward plain-spoken sermon, never, we judge from the composition, written for publication, and by no means, let us add, calculated for publication, in which he applies the term, apostacy, to the 'late event;' a term eminently inapplicable to it, as Mr. Robert Gordon in his very sensible publication shows. The publication of Mr. Bennett's sermon—a good sermon enough and suitable to his congregation, but not suitable to the inflammable temper of the public, or of the Church—is the signal for a regular riot. And we get involved in excommunications and protests, in extracts and letters and hints, and churchwardens, and curates, and ladies of title, and curates' wives, and Sicilian priests, and prosy school-masters, and 'recent converts,' Mr. New and his friend Mr. Gordon, and Mr. Gordon's brother, and Mr. Gordon's brother's wife, together with a by-play of letters advertised and then withdrawn, retractations, and explanations, and apologies, and appeals to the Bishop, too numerous and too intricate to detail, the very thought of all which complication sets the memory whirling. In the midst of all these warring winds, portly Dr. Wiseman steps in and writes the very weakest pamphlet of the set—which is saying not a little. Happily more important matters have attracted public attention; but at last the various authors got to bill-sticking and placarding. Doubtless all the parties concerned are as heartily sick and tired of the whole proceeding as we have felt all along.

'The Churchman's Diary,' (Masters,) is the best work of the kind which has appeared. The 'English Churchman's Kalendar,' from the same publisher, is also to be recommended.

A press of matter of immediate importance has compelled us to postpone notices of many books published during the quarter.

ERRATUM.—Vol. XIII. p. 310, line 18 from bottom, *for* 'these seven ultimately refrained from voting on either side' *read*, 'one of these seven,' &c.

THE

CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

APRIL, 1848.

ART. I.—1. Η ΚΑΙΝΗ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ, *ἐκ τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης κατὰ τοὺς ἑβδομήκοντα διερμηνευομένη. Novum Testamentum Græcum, editio Hellenistica. Auctore* EDV. GUL. GRINFIELD. Londini: Pickering. 1843.

2. *Hints for an Improved Translation of the New Testament. By the* REV. JAMES SCHOLEFIELD, A.M., Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Cambridge. Cambridge: Deightons. 1830.

3. *The Apostolical Authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews: an Inquiry, &c., comprising a Comparative Analysis of the Style and Structure of this Epistle, and of the undisputed Epistles of St. Paul, tending to throw light upon their Interpretation. By the* REV. CHARLES FORSTER, B.D., Rector of Stisted, Essex. London: Duncan. 1838.

4. *A Treatise on the Grammar of the New Testament Dialect, &c. By the* REV. T. S. GREEN, A.M. London: Bagster. 1842.

THE Clergy of the English branch of the Catholic Church are, by the active theory of their admission to holy orders, a learned Clergy. The requirements now actually made of candidates for the sacred function are a great advance upon what was contemplated in the canons either of 1571 or 1603. By the former it was enacted, that, 'Episcopus nemini posthâc 'manum imponet, nisi instituto in bonis literis, vel in academiâ, 'vel in inferiori aliquâ scholâ; aut qui satis commodè intelligat 'Latinam linguam, et probè versatus sit in sacris literis.' By the latter, that the candidate must 'have taken some degree of 'school in one of the Universities; or, at the least, be able to 'yield an account of his faith in Latin, according to the articles 'of religion' (Canon 34). It cannot be necessary to show either that the course of study necessary for obtaining a degree at the Universities involves much greater acquaintance with the classics, or much more handling of them, however, at the present day, than was required for the same purpose in the sixteenth or seventeenth century; nor again, that something more is now exacted as a *minimum* in ordination examinations, than 'a fair knowledge of Latin,' or of the contents of the Thirty-nine Articles in the same language. Without instituting any invidious comparison with these past ages of our Church's history in this respect, which is far from our desire, and might chance to recoil upon us in some points, we shall be safe in saying that the preparatory education of our Clergy, whatever its defects, is an expensive, liberal, learned education. And were we to lay our finger on the department of study which most clearly differences candidates of the present day from those of 200 years ago, we should specify that of the Greek language. Greek has since those days risen into the position of an universally recognised item in a liberal education, and, therefore, in that of the Clergy. A Greek 'subject,' or 'book taken up,' in modern University phrase, has taken the place of the 'Disputatio' on a 'Texte in Phylosophye,[1]' which was once the passport to a degree. And the Bishop of Exeter's design of admitting Literates to holy orders on a *Latin* examination is a just indication that, as a general rule, a competent knowledge of *Greek* is an indispensable requisite for ordination at the present day. It would seem to be only a reasonable inference from hence, that our Clergy would, with rare exceptions, be thoroughly versed in the New Testament (at the least), in the original language, at the time of their admission to their holy office; and would also, in their after-ministerial course, be facile, diligent, and *con amore* students of the Greek Scriptures. That the former part of the inference is not borne out by facts, would, we suspect, be the unanimous testimony of those to whose lot it has fallen to examine candidates. One very significant indication of the average state of Greek Testament scholarship among them is afforded by the fact, that in more than one of our dioceses we believe—certainly it was the case until very lately—*the Epistles in Greek are not expected from candidates for Deacons' orders.* We hardly know which to marvel at most, the strangeness of the distinction, or the miserably low standard of sacred scholarship which it establishes. But even in the most exacting of our examinations, how rare is it to meet with anything like an accomplished and scholarlike acquaintance with the Greek text,—that kind of acquaintance with it which a first-class man in either University possesses with classical Greek and classical authors: and how clear the proof which such an examination generally furnishes, of 'small Latin and less Greek' being still the sum of many a candidate's mental furniture, as far as the Scriptures are concerned;—of our not having made so very much advance, after all, upon that most painfully slender and piecemeal acquaintance with the Greek Testament which Burnet somewhat pithily, and withal hesitatingly, suggests as likely to be useful, 'He must then understand the New Testament. This is the 'text of our religion,—therefore a man ought to read this so 'often over that he may have an idea of the whole book in his 'head, and of all the parts of it. *He cannot have this so sure* 'unless he understands the Greek so well as to be able *to find 'out the meaning of any period in it, at least of the words and 'phrases of it.*' Nor can we augur much from such beginnings for the pursuit of sacred scholarship among the Clergy in after-life. It is, of course, difficult to speak with any certainty to such a point; but we do doubt whether habitual and delighted study of the Scriptures in the original is very common among us. That occasional or even frequent reference to the Greek Text, with a view to the composition of sermons, is a habit with not a few, here and there, we venture to hope; but this is something very different from the 'man of God' 'exercising himself day and night' in the writings of the new 'law' as they came from the inspired penmen. A good classical scholar, when composing in a language, not only writes but *thinks* in Latin or Greek, as the case may be. We fear it is not very common to think in the Greek of the New Testament; and yet there is no reason why we should not. Andrewes evidently thought in the Greek of the Seventy and in the Latin of the Vulgate, as appears by many of the turns in his sermons and his incomparable Devotions. And of his diligent and delighted 'learning and inward digesting' of the *ipsissima verba* of Evangelists and Apostles, Ridley has embalmed a touching memory in his 'last farewell,' intimating at the same time that such was the habit not of himself only, but of his fellow-collegians. 'Farewell, Pembroke Hall, of late mine own college, my care, 'and my charge. What case thou art now in, God knoweth: 'I know not well. Thou wast ever named since I knew thee to 'be studious, well learned, and a great setter forth of Christ's 'Gospel. In thy orchard (the walls, butts, and trees, if they 'could speak, would bear me witness) I learned without book 'almost all Paul's Epistles; yea, and I ween all the canonical 'Epistles, save only the Apocalypse. Of which study, although 'in time a great part did depart from me, yet the sweet smell 'thereof I trust I shall carry with me into Heaven: for the 'profit thereof I think I have felt in all my lifetime after; *and 'I ween of late* (whether they abide now or no, I cannot tell) '*there was that did the like.*'

---

[1] Peacock on the Statutes of the University of Cambridge.

Now, it is not very difficult, we conceive, to account for the unscholarlike tone, which, we fear, must thus be admitted,—theory and ordination examinations notwithstanding,—to be in practice characteristic of the clerical mind of the day. It is not, we would fain believe, and, indeed, are persuaded,—it is not that there is any lack of desire on the part of either candidates for holy orders or Clergy, to be well-instructed scholars in the Greek of the New Testament. On the contrary, no inquiry is more commonly made by junior members of the Universities, than as to the way in which they are to set about the study of it: nothing more regretted by the ordained in after-life than that, whether from lack of facility, or of appliances, or from whatever cause, as a matter of fact, the Greek Scriptures are *not* to them that delightful and profitable study they might have been expected to prove,—are not found attractive nor edifying,—and, in consequence, are not made the basis of personal study or ministerial exposition. The true reason is to be found partly in the absence of any systematic and efficient provision in the Universities, as such, for anything more than a very shallow and meagre acquaintance with the Greek Scriptures; partly in the deficiency of any well-recommended and effective course of study on the subject.

We do not undervalue the assistance of this kind afforded in the several colleges by means of lectures; but the amount of study thus elicited, of itself necessarily partial and limited, is jostled out by the more immediately pressing requirements of the B. A. degree; and, as far as our own experience goes, is so much effaced in the process, as to leave but little trace of it by the time that ordeal has been gone through. Nor can we give the recent provisions for improved theological training, at either University, the credit of having done much towards leading the student onwards in the particular path we speak of. At Oxford, it is true, professors and lectures are provided; but then it has been found impossible, in practice, to enforce the residence necessary for attendance at those lectures; hence the number of students availing themselves of them is so small as to be scarcely worth naming. The scheme, in fact, considered as an attempt to furnish the country with a theological seminary, through the medium of the University, is, in all its parts, a total failure; neither the study of the Greek Scriptures, nor of anything else, can be said to have received a particle of such impulse from it, as tells upon the theological information of the clergy at large. At Cambridge, there is no pretence of providing any such training or direction as that, the want of which we are lamenting. An examination there is, and a decided stimulus it has given to theological pursuit among candidates for holy orders; but not the shadow of a suggestion is offered—there is no provision made for its being offered—in connexion with that examination, as to the course to be pursued in order to qualify for it; much less is there any system of lectures or training for the purpose. We only mention these things as facts; we are aware of the great difficulties which impeded the establishment of a more efficient system at both Universities; but it is useless to disguise the fact that, to either of them, for any available guidance, ethical or scholastic, of candidates for the ministry of the Church, the country still looks in vain.

The other deficiency we specified was that of a really good course of reading and study, with a view to mastering and appreciating the original of the New Testament; this, at least, one might have hoped to find in the hands of students. If we cannot have training—if there is no instruction to be had—at least we might have expected to have books; to have a well-accredited and effective series of books currently in use, as handmaids to the study of the sacred text. But this is far from being the case: not one student in ten has the remotest notion of how to set about the study, nor, consequently, ever does set about it, to any purpose. The one inquiry usually made—for, as we have said, there is no lack of inquiry—is, 'What Greek Testament shall I use?' which means, good reader, not which of the world-famous 'texts,' or editions shall I adopt—whether the Elzevir 'Textus Receptus,' the text of Stephens or of Mill, of Bengel or Griesbach,—but, which of the farragoes of 'notes,' provided by Valpy and Bloomfield, Burton and Elsley, and others, am I to take for my all-sufficient guide, my *Summa totius Theologiæ?* Verily your modern divinity student is *homo unius libri,* in this department; he pins his faith upon his 'commentary.' *Dixit, ita est:* there is no appeal dreamt of from that tribunal. And, in truth, the array of authorities, ancient and modern, cited in the said 'notes,' is imposing. S. Chrysostom and Paley (very little of the former), Bos and Bishop Middleton, Grotius and Dr. Adam Clarke, the Targums and Macknight, Lightfoot and Lampe, and Rabbi Aquiba, are but a few among the motley catena of worthies laid under contribution for these miscellanies. It is not unnatural to suppose that such a work must be an all-sufficient 'vade mecum' for the student of the Greek Testament; and thus these modern 'succedanea' become the substitute for that patient, and thoughtful, and masculine study, which can alone give the student any real and comprehensive hold on the Scriptures: they are to him grammar, and lexicon, and Fathers, all in one. Nothing, we are convinced, can be more fatal to profound knowledge, and comprehensive exegesis of the New Testament, than reliance on such theological go-carts. We do not mean to decry these works altogether for beginners, but we are very anxious that they should no longer be considered as, at best, anything more than an introduction to the study they are intended to facilitate; though, indeed, against most of them, considered in themselves, there are serious objections. The scholarship of the first we have mentioned, is puerile in the extreme, not to say faulty; the author of the second possesses few qualifications for the task he has undertaken, beyond that of great laboriousness: the intolerable verbiage, and, generally, most mistaken conclusions, of his prolix annotations, are such, that we cannot altogether wonder at the rooted horror which a certain distinguished prelate of similar but somewhat differently spelt name is said to entertain, of being supposed to have perpetrated them. The work of Burton is far more scholar-like than either of these, but is so deeply tinged with the anti-Gnostic monomania, which pervades the other writings of its learned, but peculiar, author (in which, indeed, he outdoes Hammond himself), is so fanciful in many of its interpretations, and, withal, so scanty in the amount of information it conveys, that it cannot be said to be of much use; and we question if anybody ever consulted it without being disappointed.

We propose, then, in the present article, to offer some very plain and unpretending suggestions towards a more efficient study of the Greek Text of the New Testament; taking occasion, by the way, to review some of the more recent contributions to this department of theology.

And, in the first place:—

> 'Quoniam ratio hæc plerisque videtur
> Durior esse, quibus non est experta, retroque
> Vulgus abhorret ab hâc:'[1]

in other words, since the methods of study we shall recommend involve somewhat more of trouble than is commonly bestowed on this pursuit, (for, though one part of our endeavour will be to *economize* labour, we must say plainly at the outset, that we do not profess to supersede it; we have no 'royal road' to point out; 'colendi haud facilem esse viam,' must be our motto after all,) it may not be unnecessary to offer something like an 'Apology for the Greek Text of the New Testament;' to endeavour, that is, to satisfy the already highly-tasked student, or still more highly-tasked curate of souls, that the study is *tanti*—that it is so important an arm of that spiritual service to which he has dedicated himself, that it ought by all means to find a place in the armoury of his ministerial warfare.

---

[1] Lucret. I. 942.

For the more obvious considerations, which tend to recommend the study of the original in preference to that of a translation, we may refer the reader to Campbell's Dissertations, where this subject is handled at some length. We shall be content to rest the indispensableness of such a habit on one single consideration,—viz., the *impossibility*, which we do not hesitate to allege, of understanding the Epistles of S. Paul without it. What with the inevitably cramping effect of the division into chapters and verses, and what with the disguise of translation into a language of a totally different genius, the mind of any argumentative writer, by the time it reaches us through the medium of a 'version,' is wrapped in such *involucra*, is so commented on and expounded, that all freedom of march and largeness of reach is gone; the magnificent *incessus* and comprehensive sweep of the original is exchanged for short and irregular steps of which it is difficult to trace the connexion with each other. In the original all is free; in the translation all is foreclosed: in the one you read almost the thoughts and mind of the Apostle rather than his words; in the other, not so much as his words, but only an arbitrary acceptation of them. Let the translation be never so faultless as to interpretation, it must, by the nature of the case, take a line; in doing which it may or may not faithfully reflect the sense of the writer. But even if it does, there must still be much as to the *expression* which is not transferable from one language to another. This is especially the case with a writer who, like S. Paul, has an eloquence of words and expressions, as such, as well as an eloquence of matter and conception. Those who have carefully studied his writings will apprehend our meaning without difficulty. To this head belong those grand superlatives which he wields with such wonderful effect,—ὑπερεπερίσσευσε, ὑπερεπλεόνασε, ὑπερύψωσεν, καθ' ὑπερβολὴν εἰς ὑπερβολήν. Of these a translation can give but a very inadequate idea. Again, he will make use of the different πτώσεις (as Aristotle calls them)[1] of the same word—*i. e.*, the same word in all the parts of speech,—in endless variety, and with great rhetorical power. Now in many instances some only of these πτώσεις can be rendered by the correspondent variations of one word in English, and a very great loss of symmetry and point in the translation is the consequence. Thus in 2 Cor. ii. 16, we have ἱκανός; in iii. 5, ἱκανοὶ and ἱκανότης; in i. 6, ἱκάνωσεν: of which, while the first three are rendered in our version 'sufficient,' 'sufficiency,' the last, in order to be intelligible, had to be expressed by 'hath made able,' thus marring altogether the unity of the passage. So in the same Epistle, (not so unavoidably, as it should seem) φανερωθῆναι, πεφανερῶσθαι, in successive verses, are rendered by different words—viz. 'appear' and 'be made manifest.' (2. Cor. v. 10, 11.) So are πιστεύω and πίστις constantly rendered by words not cognate to each other. Now by these or other like verbal links it is that the reasoning of S. Paul in many instances coheres; and if it be often difficult, as assuredly it is, to track the connexion with certainty, even in the original, how hopeless must it be in a translation. Another well-known characteristic of S. Paul's writings is that *allusive* use of words of kindred derivation, though of different meaning, which, to avoid a lighter name, we are fain to call paronomasia. That such a usage is found there, no reader of the Greek text can question. It is one which has acquired an ill name in secular literature: nor is this to be wondered at; since, except under the guidance of the most perfect and chastened taste, it is sure to pass into vapidity or buffoonery. But against the usage itself there is, we are persuaded, no solidly founded objection. Surely the mere fact of our finding it employed in those Writings which are placed as far above the remotest suspicion of levity as the heavens are above the earth, should lead us to conclude that this, like so many other things, is no more than a good gift abused. It should be carefully observed, that S. Paul's paronomasia is never that mere jingle of similar sounds, which we have in *Non Angli sed Angeli*, and the like, and which is indeed the lowest among rhetorical artifices: but is restricted to the juxta-position, in some sort of contrast or parallelism, of words of really similar derivation. And it will be found on examination that between the words thus employed some delicate and often exquisite affinity of sense, the remains of their original connexion with each other, still subsists. When the Apostle calls his Corinthian converts 'his epistle known and read of all men,' (γινωσκομένη καὶ ἀναγινωσκομένη), is it simply because the Greek for 'to read' is derived from that for 'to know,' that the one is brought into such pointed juxta-position, as cannot fail to suggest comparison, with the latter? Surely not; there is that in the nature of the connexion between the derivative and its root, which makes the one a legitimate and beautiful expansion of the idea contained in the other. The force of the preposition in ἀναγινώσκειν is that of repetition,—'going over and over again,' as in ἀναζητεῖν, ἀναλογίζεσθαι, ἀναπεμπάζεσθαι. The written letter is, according to Greek conception, as implied in this word, intended to minister to our 'knowing and reknowing.' The self-same conception is embodied in the Latin 'recognoscere,' and our own verb to 'con'

---

[1] Rhet. lib. i.

(Saxon *connan*, 'to know'): and 'peruse' acquires its meaning through a similar process. How exquisitely, then, does the allusive word in this instance represent men as taking 'repeated knowledge' of the 'living epistle'! So, in the same epistle, 'we write none other things unto you than what ye read or acknowledge' (ἢ ἃ ἀναγινώσκετε, ἢ καὶ ἐπιγινώσκετε.) Here, again, there is a real bond of connexion between the two derivatives from the one root γινώσκω. The readers of the epistle are represented as carefully scanning, or 'conning,' the features of the doctrine therein conveyed until they recognise in them the lineaments of the teaching orally delivered to them by the Apostle at the first. In the words of S. Philip to the eunuch, γινώσκεις ἃ ἀναγινώσκεις; the manner of allusion is slightly varied—'Knowest thou, in any truer and higher sense, that, of 'the letter of which thou takest such careful knowledge in 'reading?' Now, of these or any suchlike delicate *nuances*, which give point to the Apostle's verbal allusions, the reader of a translation must be incapable of any adequate appreciation, though the existence of a verbal allusion, and the nature of it, may, of course, be explained to him. In like manner, where the two senses of an *equivocal* Greek word are employed in succession, without any notice given of the transition made from the one to the other, the passage can present to the eye of an English reader nothing but inextricable confusion, unless, by a very improbable chance, there is an exactly corresponding equivocal in English. Of this kind are the two famous passages in Gal. iii. 15, and Heb. ix. 17; in both of which it cannot be doubted that S. Paul passes—though he gives no intimation of the transition—from the 'covenant' sense of διαθήκη, which is the proper subject of his argument, to the 'testament' sense of the same word. A translation must either hopelessly confuse these passages by giving the diverse renderings, or misrepresent them by adhering to the one rendering. Our authorized version has adopted the former course in the text of Hebrews, and the latter in that of Galatians.

But these are difficulties of detail. There is one capital and pervading source of difficulty which remains to be stated. Paley has noticed, in his 'Horæ Paulinæ,'—somewhat irreverently, it has been thought, as to the expression,—that it is a habit of S. Paul 'to go off at a word,' *i.e.* to make a digression suggested by any expression he has himself employed. In noticing the thing itself, however, or in insisting on the existence of this or any other habit of style in the sacred writers, there would appear to be nothing derogatory to the inspiration we attribute to them. It has been beautifully remarked on Ezekiel's description of the 'four living creatures,' as 'having *the hands of a man* under their wings on their four sides,' that, assuming them to represent the four Evangelists (as SS. Irenæus, Athanasius, Ambrose, Augustin, Jerome, &c. do,) 'the wings will evidently represent what is Divine, 'and soars above the earth,' while 'the hands under the wings 'are very expressive of the human agents, as writing the 'Gospels according to their human affections and characters in 'subservience to inspiration.'[1] We are not at all anxious to open the difficult question of the nature of inspiration. Coleridge's 'Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit' will serve to suggest that there are difficulties in the commonly prevailing views on the subject; and the same may be said of any that may be substituted for them. All that we care to do is to hold up to imitation the line,—for systematic *view* it can hardly be called,—adopted by the Fathers in the matter. They treated the question of inspiration as they did that other great question, of which this is, indeed, a branch, of the union of Divine foreknowledge and direction with the freedom of human will and action. They fully held, and stated without hesitation as occasion arose, either side of the paradox. The Spirit is, on the one hand, ever represented by them as informing, wielding, moulding, the human instrument through which it spoke; while, on the other, the proper qualities of the human 'heart,' which 'is inditing of the good matter,' are no less unequivocally set forth as imparting this or that turn or spirit to the contents and composition of the inspired Writing. Without caring to clear and state their view on every occasion, they tacitly assumed, as an axiom in the kingdom of grace, the existence of that ineffable harmony between the mind of the Spirit and that of the spiritual man, which is so awfully pourtrayed in the sequel of the same vision of Ezekiel. 'Now as I 'beheld the living creatures, behold, one wheel upon the earth 'by the living creatures,' [*i. e.* one by each, ch. x. 9]: 'and 'when the living creatures went, the wheels went by them.... 'whithersoever the spirit was to go they went; thither was their 'spirit to go; when those went, these went; and when those 'stood, these stood.... for the spirit of the living creature was 'in the wheels.'[2] But to return: the characteristic of S. Paul's style now under consideration is more than once remarked upon, and still more often assumed, by S. Chrysostom; *e. g.* 'What mean these words when another object is proposed to 'us? This is S. Paul's custom, as I have said before, not to

---

[1] Williams on the Four Gospels, p. 13.

[2] Ezek. i. 15—21.

'treat merely of his proper subject, but if any topic occurs in-'cidentally in the course of his argument, to follow it out with 'great earnestness.'[1] It is obvious that to the efficient study of writings abounding in such digressions, comprehensiveness is indispensable;—and this, as we have endeavoured to show, is excluded by the use of a translation. But, further; the perplexity arising from this digressive habit of style is often not a little enhanced by the peculiar manner in which the principal subject is resumed. This is done, in many cases, not by abruptly breaking off the subordinate or digressing subject, but by leading it in, as it were, into reunion with the principal one. The resumption of the main topic is as easy, and gradual, and unperceived, as the divergence had been. And this very circumstance is perplexing. The reader finds himself brought back, he has scarcely observed how, to the point from which he had been called upon to take a flight into some totally different region of thought. Perhaps the best instance that can be pointed out is in Heb. v.—vii., where the most careless reader must be struck with the manner in which the subject of Melchisedec, first mentioned in v. 6, is after a first and second digression re-introduced (viz. in v. 10, and vi. 20.) While on the subject of S. Paul's intricacy of style, we would heartily recommend Mr. Forster's work on the Epistle to the Hebrews, as affording, by a careful and laborious analysis of all his Epistles, the best possible conception of the peculiarities of their composition. Among more ancient writers, S. Chrysostom's Homilies will be found very useful in unravelling the mazes of S. Paul, as he has paid great attention to this point.

Enough has, perhaps, been said to convince the most sceptical that there may be serious and even fatal disabilities attaching to the best translation, considered as a medium for conveying the mind of such a writer as S. Paul; and, indeed, one should have thought that the point hardly needed proving. But so it is, that there is a supineness as to the use of the original text very prevalent among us, fostered, in a great measure, no doubt, by the unquestionable excellence of our Authorized Version. We entertain the greatest respect for that version; but we do protest against the existence of it being made a pretext for laying aside the original: and we think that respect for it is not unfrequently carried a little too far. There is a kind of *cultus* extended to it—a Version-worship—which is anything but rational or beneficial. What are we to think of such language as the following, which we quote from the preface of one of the books named at the head of this article?

---

[1] Hom. XXVIII. on 1 Cor. xi.

> 'For myself, I would rather blot out from the catalogue of my country's worthies the names of Bacon and Newton, than those of the venerable men who were raised up by the providence of God, and endowed by his Spirit, to achieve for England her *greatest blessing* in the authorized translation of the Scriptures. If in the following pages, the professed object of which is to express opinions on minor points differing from theirs, I have dropped any expressions, in speaking of them, which even an unkind criticism can charge with a want of the most grateful veneration for them, I would gladly, if it were possible, *wash out with my tears the obnoxious passages*, and rather leave their glorious work soiled by its few human blemishes, than attempt to beautify it at the expense of their well-earned renown.'[1]

We suspect the worthies themselves, who are the subject of this glowing apotheosis, would be not a little astonished, could they rise from their graves, to find their labours, however praiseworthy, rated *quite* so high—above Ritual, and Common Prayer, and all,—and themselves occupying such exalted niches in the Temple of Fame. In saying this, we once more disavow any wish to undervalue those labours; but really, if they had written the books, instead of merely translating them to the best of their ability, more could hardly have been said of them. We do not forget the good story told by Walton, in his Life of Sanderson, of one Dr. Kilbie. Our readers probably know it by heart; but it is worth repeating in Walton's own words:—

> 'I must here stop my reader, and tell him that this Dr. Kilbie was a man of so great learning and wisdom, and so excellent a critic in the Hebrew tongue, that he was made a Professor of it in this university; and was also so perfect a Grecian, that he was by King James appointed to be one of the translators of the Bible, and that this doctor and Mr. Sanderson had frequent discourses, and loved as father and son. The Doctor was to ride a journey into Derbyshire, and took Mr. Sanderson to bear him company; and they, going together on a Sunday with the Doctor's friend to that parish church where they then were, found the young preacher to have no more discretion than to waste a great part of the hour allotted for his sermon in exceptions against the late translation of several words (not expecting such a hearer as Dr. Kilbie), and showed three reasons why a particular word should have been otherwise translated. When evening prayer was ended, the preacher was invited to the Doctor's friend's house; where, after some other conference, the Doctor told him, "he might have preached more useful doctrines, and not filled his auditors' ears with needless exceptions against the late translation; and for that word, for which he offered to that poor congregation three reasons why it ought to have been translated as he said, he and others had considered all them, and found thirteen more considerable reasons why it was translated as now printed."'

Not forgetting, we repeat, this story, and believing it to say no more than the truth of the labour bestowed on our authorized version, we, nevertheless, cannot see the necessity of making such humble apologies for venturing to consult the Greek Text for ourselves. We cannot believe that even Dr. Kilbie himself would have desired that the translation should be as a padlock on the original, sealing it up inscrutably for ever. The young preacher's fault lay not in doubting of the version, but in propounding his doubts so pedantically before such an audience. Nay, we think there is very fair reason for conceiving that the translators themselves were so far from intending to prescribe their production to the more learned and the clergy, at least, as an all-sufficient expounder of the Sacred Text, that they even invite such, as are competent, to search for themselves. We augur thus from the manner in which they have treated certain difficult passages. There are very strong appearances of their having viewed these passages as *loci conclamati,* at least for purposes of translation; either they thought them untranslatable, without using a greater degree of periphrasis than they chose to employ; or, knowing that there were many 'considerable reasons' to be alleged for several various ways of rendering, they declined to give a decision in favour of any one; or, finally, they could make nothing of the Greek as it stood, and did not choose to do violence to it. Certain it is, that they have, in many obscure passages, adopted the course of rendering the Greek, word for word, into English, without a single periphrasis to help a plain person to the meaning; thus producing, sometimes, a translation consisting of disjointed statements, of which you can make anything or nothing, so that the translation wants translating itself; at other times, what we must be excused for calling plain nonsense. An instance of the former kind is Heb. iv. 3—10. It seems impossible to suppose that they could have expected any one definite meaning to be attached to their very bald translation of these verses; it *is* just possible that they meant to leave them open, like the original, to a variety of interpretations. Another passage is the famous one in Gal. iii. 20: 'Now a mediator is not a mediator of one, but God is one.' Another, 1 Cor. xi. 10: 'For this cause ought the woman to have power on her head, because of the angels.' The same course has been adopted, as it should seem, in Gal. ii. 3, 4: 'But neither Titus, who was 'with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised: and 'that because of false brethren unawares brought in,' &c. On this, Scholefield himself frankly confesses, 'With respect to the authorized translation, I profess not to understand it.' We do not say that the example of rendering thus mechanically, so to speak, had not been set them by the Vulgate, or other famous translations; we are only taking this as an indication that they had no idea of superseding the original by any professed perfection in theirs. An instance of the other, and more extreme length,—that of leaving absolute and hopeless nonsense as a translation of the text,—is in Col. ii. 23. We doubt whether Dr. Kilbie, or any body else, could inform us what is the meaning of the following: ‘Which things have, indeed, a show of wisdom in will-worship, and humility, and neglecting of the body: not in any honour to the satisfying of the flesh.’ Even here it is undoubtedly true that the Vulgate has gone before in giving a literal, and therefore perfectly incomprehensible version: ‘non in honore aliquo ad saturitatem carnis.’ We need hardly explain, perhaps, that the key to the difficulty is, that *οὐκ ἐν τιμῇ τινι = ἐν οὐ τιμῇ = ἐν ἀτιμίᾳ*: just as in Heb. xi. 3, *μὴ ἐκ φαινομένων = ἐκ μὴ φαινομένων*: as Bishop Pearson (Creed, Art. I.) has rightly observed. It is the more remarkable, and indicates a very stern, not to say obstinate, fidelity, in King James's translators, that a very fair sense had been already extracted from the words, and that without any palpable violence, in Cranmer's and other versions. ‘Which thynges outwardly have the symilytude of wysdom by superstycyon and humblenes, and by hurtyng of the body, and *in that they do the flesshe no worshyppe vnto the nede thereof*’ (Tyndale, Cranmer). But they preferred to take refuge, with Wiclif and Jerome, in a fac-simile—somewhat of a Chinese one—of the original; and, perhaps, as compared with the Genevan version, we have fared none the worse for their scrupulousness. In that version we are presented with the following somewhat free, and about as correct as elegant, translation: ‘Which things have a show of wisdom, &c., yet are of no value, *but appertain to those things wherewith the flesh is crammed.*’ We hardly know whether we ought to place in the same category a passage, certainly very oddly translated, in 2 Cor. ix. 13: ‘Whiles by the experiment of this ministration they glorify God, for your professed subjection unto the Gospel of Christ.’ May not these remarks be applied, with no less truth, to the authorized version of many of the more difficult parts of the Old Testament? For instance, Isaiah xxx. 32: ‘And in every place where the grounded staff shall pass, which the Lord shall lay upon him, it shall be with tabrets and harps: and in battles of shaking shall he fight with it.’ And from the Minor Prophets such passages might be multiplied without number.

---

[1] Hints for an Improved Translation of the New Testament. Preface, pp. vi. vii.

We have made an extract above from the preface to Professor Scholefield's ‘Hints for an Improved Translation of the New Testament,’ and deprecated the tone there taken towards the authorized version, as unnecessarily apologetic. In justice, however, to the Professor, we must admit that the ‘Hints’ themselves are plain-spoken and unsparing enough. A work of this sort, if even creditably executed, cannot fail to be of interest; and, on the whole, the student will be quite repaid for the very slight labour of going through this small volume of annotations. Of the criticisms on really difficult passages (as Eph. v. 13; 1 Cor. ix. 15—17) we cannot speak highly. Against one little outbreak of ultra-Protestantism we must enter a protest; viz., the proposal to render S. Luke i. 48—'All generations shall call me happy.' And we confess that we are unable to account for the absence of any remark on numerous passages evidently requiring an 'improved translation;' for instance, no notice is taken of the unintelligibly-rendered place of Colossians already commented upon. Perhaps the author did not think himself bound to notice every questionable rendering. His book, however, certainly gives one the impression that he *did*, from its entering so much into minute criticisms. The scrupulous fidelity, indeed, with which he has registered most of the corrections, and, we must add, the occasional mistakes, of Bishop Middleton's book on the Greek article, reminds us of a work which a learned rabbi once informed us, in confidence, he was about to bring out, and which he expected would produce a sensation; viz., a revised version of the Old Testament, the *differentia* of which from our own was simply that all the renderings suggested in our margin would be transferred into the text. But, while handling these *minutiæ*, we wonder that Professor Scholefield should have overlooked one or two very obvious solecisms, or other errors. Such are the authorized renderings of οὐκέτι in Mark xv. 5 and 2 Cor. i. 24,—the most decided and indefensible solecisms, perhaps (setting aside those which concern the article, as more excusable), in the whole of our authorized version. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς οὐκέτι οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίθη, is rendered (after Tyndale's, Cranmer's, and the Geneva Bibles), 'But Jesus yet answered nothing.' The veriest tyro in the present day knows that it can mean nothing else than what the Vulgate and Wiclif make of it; 'nihil amplius respondebat:' 'but Ihesus answerid no more.' Again, ὅτι φειδόμενος ὑμῶν οὐκέτι ἦλθον εἰς Κόρινθον, is rendered, 'That to spare you, I came not as yet to Corinth,' after the Genevan version. Tyndale, Cranmer, and the Rheims, have it: 'I came not eny moare unto Corinthum.' But they, too, have missed the delicate shade of idiom, the recognition of which can alone help us to S. Paul's real meaning. He is speaking of a particular occasion (*vide* 1 Cor. xvi. 7), on which he had declined coming to Corinth; it would, therefore, not be to his purpose to say, 'To spare you, I never came to Corinth again;' what he does say is, 'To spare you, I did not come, as I had intended to do.' The οὐκέτι refers to the abandonment of the proposed and all but inchoate design of coming; literally, 'I left off coming.' The Vulgate rendering is the strangest of all, 'Non veni ultra Corinthum.' Another curious slip is in Rom. vi. 21, where τίνα οὖν καρπὸν εἴχετε τότε; is rendered, 'What fruit had ye then?'—the one 'then' being made to do duty for both the argumentative and the temporal particles in the Greek. The mistake began with Tyndale, and was perpetuated; the Rheims alone has it right: 'What fruit, therefore, had you then, &c.?'

Having, then, thus far endeavoured to demolish some of the outworks behind which the clerical mind of the day, in a generation more 'reading' than studious, is fain to entrench itself, viz. a reliance on the sufficiency of translations in general, and a fond belief in the absolute perfection of the 'authorized version' in particular, we gladly proceed at once with our suggestions on the study of the Greek text. We have already intimated that those suggestions will be of a plain and unpretending character. It would be very easy to draw out directions, which would *read* very learnedly, and *be* very useless. The reader would bestow a passing sigh on the impracticability, for him, of working out some gigantic system of Patristic or Neo-Germanic study,—one of the latter kind was not long ago prescribed in Dr. Tait's 'Suggestions to the Theological Student,'—and so return to his Valpy and his Scott and Henry, as before. No: if we would prevail with priest and deacon in the present day to assign some portion of their carefully mapped-out time to this pursuit, we must beware of extending too widely the bounds of the Goshen which we crave for the stranger study. We forbear, therefore, to echo George Herbert's quietly assumed axiom, 'The 'country parson hath read the Fathers also, and the schoolmen, 'and the later writers, or a good proportion of all.' Such an assumption, or anticipation, would be egregiously unreal in the present day. We would indeed, with all our hearts, that things were in that position that we could say, 'Go, by all means, to the Fathers.' It would be at once an index of strength, and a source of it, in our theology, if we could give, and all could act upon, such a direction. We speak not now of translations of the Fathers, but of the originals; between which two things there is, in our humble opinion, all the difference in the world. We dare not, as things are, place before the clergy at large a suggestion to grapple with anything so formidable. There is, we fear, a great deal to do,—προοδοποιεῖν,—before we come to that. There is a want of that hearty and healthy taste and appetite for the Greek Scriptures themselves,—nay, of that facility in the use and perusal of them, which can alone make Patristic study rational. How shall he soar with Chrysostom, or dive with Origen, who can walk but stumblingly on that *terra firma* of the Scriptures, which it is their object to illustrate? The

> 'Nocturnâ versate manu, versate diurnâ,'

must really be applied to the lexicon, to the grammar, and ordinarily accredited helps, first, or 'turning of the book' will proceed but wearily when the tomes of the Catholic Doctors are in hand. The Fathers are the princes among expositors; let no man take their crown. But they are not dictionaries. They are the true 'Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus;' but seeing they are not 'ordine alphabetico concinnati,' like Suicer, they will be found to yield up their treasures at a slow rate, to such as are not ready at threading the mazes of their secret mine. Let us be content to begin at the beginning. Let us learn to love the glowing words of the Evangelists and Apostles as they fell from their pen, before we are sanguine of appreciating those of the great doctors and teachers who drank so deeply of their spirit. Let us not be misunderstood. There are those to whom the study of these, as it is feasible for them, so is it a duty incumbent upon them, and acknowledged by many to be such. There are the residents at the Universities; there are parochial clergy here and there, in the enjoyment of more than the average facility or leisure: of these, all ought to be, and many we doubt not are, 'well seen in Fathers.' But by far the majority, we venture to consider, have yet to attain the vantage-ground from which that fruitful field of exposition can be profitably entered upon.

But is there not, we may be asked, a serious objection to such a method of studying the sacred text as the above remarks point to? Are we not, it will be said, placing the Scriptures in the original in the student's hands, for him to make out his own interpretations of them? Once open the flood-gates of criticism, it will be argued, and what security have you against the influx of that tide of rationalistic interpretation which is ever on the rise in Germany, and ever ready to inundate the broad lands of the Church's patrimony throughout Christendom? Our suggestions not involving, as a first requisite, the study of the Fathers, we shall seem to be setting aside the only guides whose direction can render such critical study safe, and ensure its results being in conformity with the Catholic faith. This is a very weighty objection, if justly incurred, and deserves a most full reply. No observer of the times can shut his eyes to the reality and the greatness of the danger which menaces us from the Rationalistic quarter. The fascinations of German divinity do unquestionably already exercise an undue power over the views of not a few favourite theological writers of our day. Some hints to this effect have already appeared from time to time in our pages,[1] and it may be necessary before long to speak more plainly. And, again, it is a very serious charge, that of deserting the Fathers. Nevertheless, let no one be disquieted at the setting forth of a scheme of scriptural study in which the writings of the Fathers are not *nominatim* included. Our vindication is easy and obvious. In the first place, let it be remembered that we are not now aiming at forming the *finished* Theologian: we are but proposing that the tomes of the Fathers should be allowed a temporary repose on their shelves, while the student is as yet but *planè hospes* in the original text of Scripture. This, however, we admit, were no defence, if the student were, for lack of such actual perusal of the Catholic Doctors, left without any other guide to the sense of Scripture than his own imaginations and criticisms. But who will say that this is the case with any faithful and dutiful Churchman? If he does not find the mind of the Fathers in the Creeds, and the Liturgy, and the Catechism, we would fain know where he shall seek it. And for ninety-nine plain Churchmen out of a hundred, it is in these, and in these only, that the Fathers are likely to be read. Let us not attempt to bolster up an exaggerated impression of our orthodoxy, or of our learning rather, by talking big about 'reading the Fathers.' *Non cuivis homini contingit,* at least in our days. Readers of them we must have, and ought to have, as has been already admitted: but as to their becoming the usual and universal *apparatus criticus,* even of our clergy, it is as mere a chimera as ever entered into the head of any man. Suppose the man of average or inferior calibre to begin with the 'Pastor of Hermas,' and the 'De Patientiâ' of Tertullian, about what time, we would fain ask, would he be likely to arrive at the works of SS. Augustine and Chrysostom? Or what sort of power would he possess of classifying his patristic lore, so as to bring it to bear efficiently on the interpretation of Scripture? No: we shall probably never have a clerical body universal and deep readers of the Fathers. But we may say with the poet—

> 'What matter? if the waymarks sure
> On every side are round us set,
> Soon overleaped, but not obscure?'

Negatively, the plain Churchman is secured against any risk of serious error, however earnestly he may throw himself into the critical study of the Scriptures. He may not always know *how* the earlier Church expounded such passages, *e. g.*, as 'My Father is greater than I,' so as to be in harmony with the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity. But he does know that they did *not* interpret them in any way to contravene that doctrine: so far he is in possession of their mind on that or any other passage. 'The Creed that with the Church was born' is his; and all the Fathers and Councils in the world could not add to that deposit of truth, though they might and would direct men to infinite ways of educing or applying it. They may heighten the beauty of the Spouse in the eyes of men by their glowing thoughts and words, but they cannot add a single feature to her perfect and divine lineaments. The Catholic Christian scholar, therefore, alike on the lowest or the highest form, is sufficiently fortified, if he be only true to himself and the Church, against rationalistic influences, though he may never have read a line of the Fathers. And if a stand be duly made on this impregnable rampart, not only will the waves of this Germanic ocean be successfully beaten back, but it will fare with the critical matter, which that troubled sea heaves up from the abyss, much as it does with the sea-sand and marine plants which incorporate themselves with the dyke of the sturdy Hollander, and lend stability to it; for we shall find among it much that may strengthen the hands of orthodox interpretation.

---

[1] See our article on 'Judaism and the Jerusalem Bishoprick,' (*Christian Remembrancer*, No. LIII.), especially note, vol. xii. p. 243.

To proceed then with what we may call our *Novum Organon*. It bears, indeed, in a humble way, some affinity to the great work so called. And first, as in no other sense claiming to be *new*, than as not being the prevailing one. Bacon's μέθοδος was no new microscope or telescope to survey the sciences through, but a call to men to return to more rational and intelligent use of the means already at their disposal. We, in like manner, are not about to import any foreign nostrum, such as is every now and then propounded among our continental neighbours, as a master key to the New Testament. And whereas, again, the illustrious pioneer of modern philosophy adopted the method of first removing such objections as lay against learning in general,[1] and afterwards surveying the whole existing field of it, with a view to exploding impertinences, and indicating the most profitable direction for science to move in for the future,[2]—to the former of these points, as it concerns our own subject, we have already spoken; upon the latter we are about to enter—with this limitation, however, that our object is not so much to set forth a perfect as a practicable method of study. Not but that, by the way, a scheme of sacred study *omnibus numeris absolutum*, more exact, and on a larger scale, than we dream of propounding here, is among our *desiderabilia*. And the first step towards it would necessarily be to ascertain what has been done, and done well, and placed at the student's disposal, in each department. It were, indeed, a worthy undertaking, to do for Biblical criticism what Bacon did for learning at large; viz. to map out the whole of that vast territory, noting what regions of it have or have not been fully explored, with a view to the deficiencies being some day supplied; 'to enter into a view and examination of what parts of that learning have been prosecuted and what omitted; for the opinion of plenty is amongst the causes of want; and the great quantity of books maketh a show rather of superfluity than of lack; which surcharge, nevertheless, is not to be remedied by making no more books, *but by making more good books*, which, as the serpents of Moses, might devour the serpents of the enchanters;'—to quote his own words. 'Wherefore,' he proceeds, 'I will now attempt to make a general and faithful perambulation of learning, with an inquiry what parts thereof lie fresh and waste, and not improved and converted by the industry of man; to the end that such a plot, [*i. e.* ground-plan, map,] made and recorded to memory, may both minister to any public designation, and also serve to excite voluntary endeavours.'[1] True it is, that the 'fresh and waste parts' would bear a far less proportion to the cultivated in Biblical than in general learning; yet there are not a few provinces which might well bear a more exact survey than they have yet received. Admitting even that not very much more is to be looked for, either in the region of Philology, whether Hebrew, Rabbinical, or Greek, or in that of illustrations from ancient or modern Oriental customs, or in that of contemporary history, it would still be too much to say that these sources of criticism are absolutely exhausted. It is not so very long since Schoettgen more than doubled the Rabbinical illustrations collected and applied by Lightfoot: parallelism, which must be acknowledged to have done much, if sometimes too much, for sacred criticism, in the hands of Lowth and Jebb, is but of yesterday. 'Undesigned coincidences,' if noticed in a reverential temper, greatly tend to clear our historical conception of many of the scripture narratives; and these were first pointed out, in any number, by Lardner and Paley, and only very recently, as regards the Old Testament and the Gospels, by Professor Blunt. No one, again, who has read that curious and compendious little book, 'Egypt, her Testimony,' &c. can doubt that Egyptian hieroglyphics and paintings have at length begun to do something real and tangible for Biblical antiquities,[1] by enacting the long desiderated part of contemporary Historian. Finally, the enthusiastic but ingenious and learned Mr. Forster is positive that he has discovered an inscription, not only engraved in the time of Joseph, but in the *letters of the first alphabet known to mankind*. In short, as there can be no question that we know many things about the Bible which the Seventy and the Fathers did not know, so there is no reason why we should not come to know still more. It would be not without its use, then, to have come to something like an understanding as to what we do want. To mention one or two of the more obvious of these wants: the Books of Job and Ecclesiastes are still, for the most part, a mighty riddle, and might well exhaust a life of profound and meditative study. A S. Jerome, for instance, on the latter, fails to satisfy us, the obscurity of the text constantly driving him to mystic interpretations. In the New Testament, a careful and really profound analysis of the Epistles of S. Paul, according to their several characteristics, based on strictly sound doctrine,—something in the manner of S. Chrysostom, but less discursive,—is greatly needed. Mr. Forster's volume on the Epistle to the Hebrews furnishes an excellent frame-work for such an analysis, by bringing out to view what he has called the *key-texts* in each Epistle; but there are many minor allusions to the proper subject in each case, which his plan necessarily left untouched. For want of such an analysis we doubt whether many students have any *distinctive* idea, for instance, of the five last of S. Paul's Epistles to Churches; whereas, in reality, amid much *primâ facie* resemblance, they are as distinct each from the other in subject, composition, and spirit, as the Œdipus Rex from the Trachiniæ, or the Prometheus Vinctus from the Agamemnon.

---

[1] Bacon, 'Advancement of Learning,' Book I.

[2] Ibid. Book II.

---

[1] Ibid. ubi suprà.

Again, how many passages of more than ordinary obscurity are there which, in most Commentaries, receive not much more attention and discussion than the rest of the text, or, however, nothing in proportion to their greater difficulty. The whole subject and *entourage* of such passages needs to be thoroughly sifted: in fact, a book might with great advantage be written on some of them, as books have been written on 1 John v. 7, and Heb. ix. 17. But, besides such original works, how much remains still to be done in the way of useful and necessary compilation from existing *sylva et supellex*, and concentration of scattered lights on particular points. 'The last of the Fathers'

---

[1] We would particularly draw attention to the reasoning by which the identification of the 'Children of Sheth,' in Numb. xxiv. 17, with Ammon and Moab is accounted for, as one of the happiest and most conclusive applications of hieroglyphic lore that has ever come under our notice.

(S. Bernard of Clairvaux,) has been dead 700 years, and as yet we have no entire Catena of the Fathers on the Scriptures. A digest of their matter is well known to be in progress in the hands of members of our own communion, whose names are a sufficient guarantee for the work being a precious gift to the Church. And a noble example of a work of concentrated illustration is already in part before the public in Mr. Barrett's (of King's College, Cambridge,) laborious synopsis of the remarks of such critics as have differed in any respect from our Authorized Version. But all this by the way.

1. Our first recommendation, then, to the student of the Greek text—*ὀψιμαθής*, or other—is to throw away all 'notes,' and make the simple and unvarnished text his study. He would do well, too, to be provided with an edition, portable for size, and for arrangement readable, that it may be really his manual, the familiar of his study and his closet, and his companion in the very sanctuary. There are not many editions which answer this description. The Oxford 'Juxta Exemplar Millianum' is just one degree too large, and is divided into our chapters and verses—to say nothing of the startling peculiarity of some of the Millian *punctuation*. Bagster's 'Polyglot,' and many other sufficiently portable editions, have the same capital fault of being broken up into verses. Among those which avoid this error we can mention with approbation Ditton's Leyden, or Glasgow edition, adopting, for the most part, the readings of Griesbach. But nothing can be imagined better than the Oxford edition of Bishop Lloyd. The type clear, yet scholar-like, and free from superfluous capitals—the Stephanian division into verses *consulto profligatum*, (editor's preface,) and the notation of it thrown into the margin—the text, Mill's—the punctuation, Bengel's—the division into periods, his also—the references, Curcellæus'—finally, the size of the volume a convenient medium (royal 18mo.), and the margin left for references fair and ample; it certainly is the prince of portable editions. The unencumbered flow of the text is of itself sufficient to make the reading of it a totally different thing from that of the same text broken and disjointed in the usual way. On this subject we cannot possibly improve upon the nervous language of Bishop Lloyd himself in his Preface: 'Nemo est qui neget, per eam divisionem, sententiarum 'nexum, historiarum seriem, et argumentorum ordinem distrahi 'atque disrumpi. Ex eâdem etiam versuum divisione præcipuè 'nata est pessima illa et ab omni criticâ abhorrens consuetudo, 'singulos (quod aiunt) textus S. Scripturæ laudandi et adducendi, nullo sive ad contextum sive ad scriptoris animum habito 'respectu. Eam igitur consultò profligamus, in posterum, si ex 'nostro calculo res penderet, perpetuò profligandum.' Such an

edition of the text as this, then, being supposed to be adopted, we undertake to say that any person taking up, for example, the Epistle to the Ephesians, as if it were perfectly new to him, and reading it through as a whole, and in this form, for the first time, would find that it really *was* new to him. He would be astonished to discover how narrow had been his previous conception of the Apostle's mind in that Epistle. He would see that S. Paul is his own best paraphrast after all; that connexions, transitions, and resumptions, which would require many a verbose note to trace and explain, are seen by their own light, and explain themselves when thus fairly exhibited. Those breathless parentheses, (even such as iii. 2—14, and on again to iv. 1, of this epistle,) where the sense is held *in suspenso* so long, require comparatively little effort to follow them out, keeping an eye still on the clue presently to be resumed, when the text is thus presented as really one whole, however complex. For sustaining such eagle-like soarings as these, a translation is as Dædalus with his waxen wings to the bird of Jove—flagging and losing sight of its object before the flight is half accomplished. Or, if our readers will bear with another metaphor, the student in the one case views from an eminence the stream of the Apostle's thought in its entire course, how,

> 'With many a winding nook it strays,
> In willing sport, to the wild ocean;'

in the other he commands but a single reach of the stream at a time. The instance of parenthetical writing to which reference has just been made is a more complicated one than common. Much difference of opinion has existed as to where the sense, dropped in iii. 1, is resumed. The truth would seem to be that it is not resumed as a whole at any one point, but in parcels, as it were, at several; the exordium being, *τούτου χάριν ἐγὼ Παῦλος ὁ δέσμιος τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν τῶν ἐθνῶν.* Part of the expression, (*διὸ-τούτου χάριν*), and part, also, of the *thought* of the exordium, (viz., his desire that they should not be afflicted at his imprisonment,) is resumed at v. 13:—(*διὸ αἰτοῦμαι μὴ ἐκκακεῖν ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσί μου ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν*) but only a part. There was yet another desire in his mind in that exordium; this he takes up and pursues in verses 14—21. Neither so is the aim of those first few words exhausted. He once more, in ch. iv. 1, resumes in effect the entire expression and thought of them, (with the exception of *ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν τῶν ἐθνῶν*), and points them towards that which had been throughout his ultimate aim—the improvement of their practice:—*παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς ἐγὼ ὁ δέσμιος ἐν Κυρίῳ, ἀξίως περιπατῆσαι, κ. τ. λ.*

2. The next consideration is, as to the apparatus or appliances

necessary for a critical understanding of the Greek text. The state of the case is this: certain books, written, it is true, by inspired persons, but in human language, and with all the ordinary characteristics of language, are put into the student's hands. Assuming these writings to be all of one family—as their belonging to so nearly the same date, (ranging for the most part, over from twenty-five to thirty years only,) and the similar circumstances in which their writers were placed, would seem to justify our assuming—the question arises, To what quarter may we most reasonably look for help towards understanding them? Are there any other writings, profane or otherwise, belonging to the same family? Do any writers stand in that relation to the sacred authors in which Homer stands to Hesiod, or the great Italian poets to each other? Is there any recognisable style, dialect, or whatever name we may give to characteristic forms of speech, in which the Apostles and Evangelists may rightly be considered to have written, and which may be studied in the works of predecessors or contemporaries of theirs? Here we open up a mighty question which sorely convulsed the theological world in the seventeenth century. The primary form of the discussion was, whether the style of the New Testament writers was purely Attic, as maintained long before by Stephens. The opinion, however paradoxical, was obstinately maintained by some, while others, with no less warmth, were for relegating the inspired writers to a place among the *Hellenistic* authors, and pronouncing them to have written in the Hellenistic dialect. Some idea of the almost amusing earnestness of the combatants may be gathered from the titles of the works which issued on either side. The honour of the sacred writers was thought to be impugned by their being suspected of having written in any other dialect than the purest Attic. It was pronounced by the Atticizers a 'barbarous crimination.' Innocency of such intention was pleaded in the most moving terms by the Hellenizers. The whole mass of Hellenizers was, however, consigned over to the most detestable heresy. '*Diatribe de Ling. Gr. N. T. Puritate,*' '*Trias Propositionum Studium N. T. à Barbaris Criminationibus Vindicantium,*' '*Innocentia Hellenistarum Vindicata,*' '*Defensio Triados, 1ma, 2da, 3tia,*' followed each other in rapid succession. The skirmishing was at its height when the renowned Salmasius, perceiving with eagle eye the weak point of the whole contest, stooped from his height, and carried off the subject of it to a different region of inquiry—changed the venue, and brought the matter on in another court. He showed, most satisfactorily, that they were both wrong; that while the style of the New Testament is certainly not Attic, it is as certainly not 'Hellenistic;' there being, in fact, no such thing in nature as a 'Hellenistic dialect.' We cannot pretend here to go at any length into the details of his curious and instructive, and, in our humble judgment, unanswerable, '*Commentarius controversiam de Lingua Hellenisticâ decidens;*' which was followed by two others, bearing titles conceived in a strain of vehemence borrowed from the tactics of the belligerent parties: '*Fumus Linguæ Hellenisticæ,*' '*Ossilegium Ling. Hell.*' Suffice it to say, that he manifests a Bentleian power of concentrating scattered information suitable to his purpose, and, we must add, a Bentleian bitterness of scorn in heaping it on the heads of his luckless adversaries. Setting out from an exact and scholar-like definition of 'dialect' as 'a distinctive mode of speaking,' (deriving *διάλεκτος*, as applied to language, not from *διαλέγεσθαι*, but from *διαλέγειν*, *discernere*), he shows that the supposed 'Hellenistic' never was the 'distinctive speech' of any people on the face of the earth; that there never had been opportunity for the formation of those distinctive usages of pronunciation and inflexion which constitute the characteristics of a dialect, and the absence or presence of which is the test of any given writing being or not being composed in it. The name *κοινὴ διάλεκτος*, which was one of the names given to this supposed dialect, is a contradiction in terms; if 'common' to many nations, or a conglomerate of the manners of speech of several, it is no 'dialect.' Vain, therefore, was the attempt to reduce that 'heap and fry of authors,' (as Milton designates a more reverend company,) which Alexander hatched and the Ptolemies nurtured on the banks of Nile, and which received motley accessions from all lands by the space of 300 years, to a semblance of marching under one banner, and speaking one dialect. All that they had in common was their negative character, of not being purely Attic, Ionic, Doric, or Æolic. The Seventy, and Jesus the son of Sirach, and Manetho, and Berosus, and Euclid, and Apollonius Rhodius, and Theocritus, and Polybius, and Plutarch, and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and Philo, and Josephus, might indeed form a *school*, in some sense: but they wrote in no *dialect;* they acknowledged no standard. It followed inevitably that, though the Hellenizing party were right in impugning the pure Atticism of the New Testament writers, there was a flaw in the process; their plea could not be maintained; *de non existentibus*, &c.,—they could not write in a dialect which did not exist.[1] The new question which Salmasius raised upon the ruins of the old inquiry was, In what way might these writings, clearly referable to no dialect properly so called, be most fitly characterized? From what source, if indeed from any, did they derive their main peculiarities? The answer which he gave to this question will be considered presently; meanwhile, we would observe that the issue to which he brought the original controversy has a most important bearing on our inquiry as to what are the cognate writings necessary or desirable to be studied in illustration of the Greek text of the New Testament. Plausible as is the theory not unfrequently propounded or hinted at, that what is called the Alexandrine, or Macedonian, or Hellenistic school of writers, must needs be the most germane to the purpose, we see that it will not bear examination. They were themselves either mere *imitatores, servum pecus,* getting as near the purer forms of Greek as they could, and so no masters in style for anybody to follow;—or, if they had their peculiarities, these were provincialisms of their several countries. These last may be shared in some instances by the sacred writers; and so far forth, those writers may be occasionally capable of illustration from the school in question; but that is all that can be said. What we are anxious to establish, then,—and we think it follows incontestably from the arguments of Salmasius—is this, that there is no such paramount necessity for a critical acquaintance with the voluminous writings and mongrel style of Philo and Josephus and the rest, as that the student need be disquieted at not possessing, as not one student in fifty does possess, any acquaintance with that school. We would by no means disparage the study of those authors, whether for matter or language, by such as have leisure for it; they are valuable auxiliaries in their way; but we are bold to say that the classical writers are, after all, at the least as good a preparation as any for New Testament study; that the style of S. Luke, *e.g.*, in the Acts of the Apostles, is more like that of Xenophon than of Philo. The ordinarily educated English clergyman or candidate for holy orders, therefore, may enter

---

[1] On referring to Carpzov, (*De Versione LXX. Virale*), we observe that he represents the controversy as a personal one between Salmasius and Heinsius—an impression which his *Commentarius* does not give: the point is, however, unimportant. The account which Carpzov gives of the literary digladiation is too

---

piquant to be omitted. 'Heinsius Hellenisticam comminisci et defendere cœpit 'cum dialectum, tum gentem. . . . Hâc vero novâ ab se conditâ gente ac 'dialecto, Heinsius ita bilem movit literatorum principi, Claudio Salmasio, ut 'calamum adversus illam stringens, A.D. 1643, integro *de Hellenisticâ Commentario,* rursus *funere Linguæ Hellenisticæ,* tandemque *Ossilegio,* graviter illam 'profligaret, et Heinsii sententiam tantum non funditus subverteret. Ab hoc 'tempore itum est in partes, ita tamen, ut præcipua eruditorum turba, relictis 'Hellenistarum castris, ad Salmasii accederet sententiam.' With these last words we must compare the statement of Jahn, (quoted by Horne, vol. ii. p. 20,) 'that since 1730—40 the cause of the Hellenists has predominated throughout Europe.' Equidem mallem cum Salmasio errare.

without misgiving upon the study we are recommending, so far as concerns a sufficient scope or line of preparative reading. The so commonly read classical authors are a sufficient basis for him to take his stand upon.

There is, however, one notable exception to the canon which we have just ventured to enunciate. There is one illustrious work, one remarkable and important body of writings, among those above enumerated as productions of the Alexandrine school, which is deserving of the most careful study on the part of the critical student of the New Testament. Yet, not *eo nomine*, not *as* belonging to that school, or only in a comparatively small degree on that score, but for a reason totally distinct and peculiar to the work alluded to. We have seen Salmasius, after dissipating the commonly entertained notions about the style of the New Testament, changing the inquiry to this: Whether there was any type or model to which it might be referred as having tended in any principal measure to mould its phraseology and composition? Could any name be given to its style? He suggests an answer and a name; by far the best, probably, that could be given. The name is one which (παχυλῶς, and ὥς ἐν τύπῳ,) comes as near to a description as the nature of the case admits. He would call the style or manner of speech which we find in the New Testament, the ἑρμηνευτικὸς λόγος. Of all causes and influences which tended to make the language of the New Testament what it is, none can for a moment be put in competition with that most ancient and famous VERSION commonly known as ‘Η πάλαια διαθήκη κατὰ τοὺς Ο,’ *LXX. Seniorum Versio;* in our own familiar language, the *Septuagint.* A strange and somewhat peculiar interest hangs over the literary history of this celebrated translation. The region of the LXX. is the *fabulosum littus* of biblical criticism. For ages it basked in the golden light which a lively φαντασία had cast over it; and none dreamed of disputing the correctness of the accounts which had been brought of that unknown shore. Aristeas, and Josephus, and Justin Martyr, were thought sufficient authority for the well-known tale of ‘The Seventy-and-two Interpreters.’ True, these authorities were all copying one another; and the original document, professing to be the work of Aristeas, was forged by some zealous Jew; and Justin falls into a huge anachronism, making Ptolemy Philadelphus send to *Herod* for his translators. But it was an uncritical age, and a harmless tale at least; and Justin Martyr had seen the remains of the seventy-two cells in which the translators had produced each one identically the same translation; and none cared to inquire further. The tale, as originally told by the Pseudo-Aristeas, is rich with oriental splendour and circumstance—a gloriously gilded *mendacium*. It recites how the second Ptolemy stood in the midst of the twenty myriads of volumes which he had amassed in his library, and marvelled if there was any corner of the bibliographical world yet unconquered and unransacked, when mention was made by one, of the Hebrew Scriptures, as well worthy of a place there, could but a translation of them be obtained. And then, how at the instance of Aristeas himself, his prime minister, the king liberated 100,000 Jews, captives in Egypt, at a cost of 600 talents, as a propitiatory offering to win the consent of the high-priest to a translation. It were long to tell of the royal gifts, the mission of the Seventy-and-two elders, six of each tribe, in compliance with the royal request; of the copy of the Scriptures, written in letters of gold, which they bore with them to Egypt, and of the king's sevenfold prostration before it; of the seven days' feasting with which they were received, and the 'hard questions' wherewith the king proved them, rewarding their replies with three talents of gold a-piece. And the rest of the story, of their cells in the Isle of Pharos, is well known. Such, then, is the primeval fable concerning this version. The subsequent history of opinion and belief about it is scarcely less remarkable. It has been lauded and condemned, canonized and cursed, held to be of inspired authority, and of no authority at all, by Jews and Christians, ancients and moderns. It has been positively asserted that the writers of the New Testament were totally unacquainted with it; and, as positively, that they never quote from any other version, nor possessed the Old Testament in any other form. The Jews out of the Holy Land universally ascribed it to the Spirit of God: the native Jews, to the devil. The Jews of Egypt, if we may believe Philo, kept a yearly *feast* in the Isle of Pharos in honour of it, and thanked God for the days when the light of that interpretation first visited them: the Jews of Palestine, if we may believe their own writers, kept a yearly *fast* of three days in memory of the same event, and compared it to the three days' darkness which overspread Egypt on another occasion. It has been deemed inspired (besides the Jews, as aforesaid) by S. Irenæus, and S. Clemens Alexandrinus, and, at one time at least, by S. Jerome; by Sixtus Senensis, and the author of the preface to the edition of Pope Sixtus V., and by Isaac Voss; and denied to be so by the great majority of all ages and countries. Innumerable theories have been invented to account for and correct its errata. Some have taken in hand to correct it by the Hebrew; others, to correct the Hebrew by it. Its variations from that text have been ascribed to chance, to time, to malice, to inspiration. But the strangest reason for them of all is assigned by Ludovicus Vives, viz. that the Hebrew copy used by the LXX. translators had, by some mischance, *been run through and through with a dagger*, (*pugione perfossos*), so that many words were illegible. Carpzov does not know what to make of this legend; we believe we can throw some light on it. The good man would appear to have carried away a confused notion of a passage in S. Jerome, in which he says that Origen, in his Hexapla edition of the LXX. version, 'prefixed an *obelus*,' (dagger,) as the manner was, 'to those passages which are not found in the Hebrew, thereby signifying *that they were to be stabbed or run through*, (*jugulandum et confodiendum*) as suppositious.'[1] And as Vives lived in the dawn of reviving literature—he was the first Fellow of Corpus Christi, Oxford, in 1517, and tutor to the Princess Mary—even such a blunder as this, supposing our account of it correct, must not be visited upon him too hardly. It is not very dissimilar to that by which it has been assumed that 'the thorn in the flesh' which St. Paul suffered from, was no other than a *headache*, because he calls it 'a messenger of Satan *to buffet* him,' (*κολαφίζειν*, lit. to beat on the head.)

In such a sea of counter-statements and counter-opinions, the reader will be ready to doubt whether any *terra firma* is to be found. Thanks, however, to learned labours, such a *locus standi* is not wanting; and the real history of the great Version is scarcely less remarkable than the imaginary. The truth is as strange as the fiction; and, after all, the cloud of mystery has been lifted but in part from that distant region. There is enough explained to satisfy inquiry to a great degree, yet enough that is inexplicable to leave us wondering still. It is not to be doubted, then, that the translation of the Hebrew Scriptures which bears the name of the LXX. was made, as far at least as the Pentateuch, in the era of the Ptolemys,—most probably when P. Lagus and his son P. Philadelphus reigned jointly: *i. e.* A.C. 286-5. Curious and careful investigations have further established the following points:—That it was not composed pursuant to any public edict, but by the labours of private persons,—Jews of Alexandrian or Macedonian speech: that it is the work of various hands: that it was not done all at once, but at considerable intervals; all, however, (with the exception of the translations of the Song, and the prophecy of Daniel, which are ascribed to Symmachus and Theodotion respectively,) before the Christian era: that the law of Moses was completed first, and by a different hand and in a superior style to all the rest; the Prophets in the time of

---

[1] S. Hieron. ad Suniam et Fretelam.

Antiochus Epiphanes, when they first began to be read publicly; and some, as Ezekiel and Amos, more skilfully than others, as Isaiah and Obadiah: that it was rendered from the original Hebrew text, and not from the Samaritan or the Chaldee copy: that its variations from the Hebrew are to be attributed to various accidental causes—as the absence of the *points* in the copy used, imperfect information, Jewish bias, lapse of time, heretical and Judaizing corruption of copies of the LXX, &c.: that the writers of the New Testament were familiarly acquainted with it, and that the vast majority[1] of their quotations are transcribed *verbatim*, or with unimportant variations, from it, though they on occasion desert it for the Hebrew, or the Hebrew for it: that the Fathers quote freely from it, but, with one or two exceptions, did not think it inspired: finally, that the style, so far as it can be classified, is an impure, Hebraizing, nationalizing, form of Greek.

On this statement of facts, one or two remarks suggest themselves; and first, that after all, the mist which has ever hung over the origin of this version is parted, not dispelled. Out of it 'fingers come forth as of a man's hand;' and we 'see the part of the hand that writes;' moreover, we are certified that 'the great roll' is 'written in *with a man's pen*.' But of who the actual writers were, much more of the circumstances under which they wrote, we are still profoundly ignorant. And then, when we combine this with the mysterious yet undeniable fact which meets us further down in the history, that inspired Apostles and Evangelists were content to view the Old Scriptures, as a general rule, through the medium of this translation—to take the LXX. impression of the mind of the Spirit in those Old Scriptures, we cannot but recognise in the obscurity which surrounds the authorship of this work, an analogous economy of 'the providence of Divine Grace' to that which meets us elsewhere in similar cases. Much as we know of the inspired authors of the several books of the Old and New Testament, in no one instance is there so much as a fragment of record as to the immediate circumstances and accidents which surrounded the writers at the time of producing them. We know that the men existed, and somewhat of their history, and—that their books are in our hands.

---

[1] Of these quotations, seventy-five are verbatim; forty-seven more, nearly so; thirty-two more agree *in sense* with the LXX.; eleven, only, agree with the Hebrew where it differs from the LXX; six, for certain, agree with the LXX. where it differs from the Hebrew; nineteeen agree with neither: vide Horne, Introd., vol. ii., p. 324, sqq. To this statement it must be added that a considerable number of references and allusions are made to the LXX. sense or wording of passages where it seems totally irreconcilable with the Hebrew.

No day, or week, or month, is named, or can be named, for the committal to writing of any one book in the Bible. No man stood by and saw Moses, or Samuel, or Ezra, or the Prophets, or S. John, or S. Paul, in the act of writing; or, if any did, he was not permitted to record it. No eye was witness to the illapses of the Spirit, which quickened 'the lively oracles;' no knowledge of the details of authorship encumbers our conception of the awfully-gifted men who 'testified of these things, and wrote these things.' So has it been, too, with other great instruments wherewith God designed to work through the Church:[1] *e.g.*, the four Fontal Liturgies; the 'four heads,' into which 'the River' of Eucharistic Grace, that 'went forth to water the garden' of God's Church, 'was parted;' or call them three, by which, as by the sons of Noah, 'the whole earth was overspread.' Of these, the authors are traditionally said to be known; and the great fact of their several origination is patent and unquestioned:' but there the cloud interposes. So is it, we dare to say, with the compilation of the reformed Offices of the English branch of the Church Catholic. The names of the compilers of the Book of Common Prayer, &c. are preserved, and almost their every public action, save this, known and registered: this alone withdraws into the shadow. A dim chamber in an antique house at Cambridge is pointed to as the scene of their labours; but no greater degree of circumstance can be alleged for the transaction; as much is left to the imagination to fill up here, as at Patmos or the Mamertine prison. No man can lay his finger on any part of the original Book of Edward VI., and assign it to any one person as his composition or selection. Thus, then, is it ever, as it should seem, when the creature is preparing and shaping under the Divine Hand, whether by the way of inspiration, or of lower forms of influence, for high issues. And the fact that the LXX. version bears this quasi-sacred character, and was withdrawn, as to its formation, within this hallowing veil of mysteriousness, ought, we conceive, to insure it a more reverent estimation than it commonly enjoys.

It has been our object, in giving this account of the LXX. Version, simply to put the student in possession of what it is that he is invited to enter upon, when the study of that version is commended to him as a help towards the critical reading of the New Testament. We believe that very loose notions generally prevail on this subject. The Septuagint is looked upon with a vague feeling of dislike, or doubt, or suspicion, by most persons. It is thought by some so hard, by others so easy, that it cannot be of much use as a help to understanding the Bible. Those who have read a few chapters of Genesis in it, think it uselessly easy and near to the English version; those who have read a few in Isaiah, think it hopelessly hard, and removed, in parts, from that version. The Church of Rome is known to have gone near to pronouncing it inspired; and there is a dim apprehension of giving countenance to such a view by using it. The corrective for these doubts and apprehensions is a right conception of the facts of the case, such as we have endeavoured to state them. At the lowest view, this version, with all its faults, cannot but yield many excellent uses, even as an instrument for the better understanding of the Old Testament. It will, at least, serve to set the matter of it before us with the freshness and novelty of another and more expressive language than our own. Our object, however, is not here to recommend it for this purpose, but solely in its bearing on New Testament study. One respect in which it ministers to this end has been incidentally noticed in the above review of its history and contents:—it supplies, on occasion, what is no where else to be found,—no, not in the Hebrew text; the form under which the New Testament writers adopted and employed the materials furnished by the Spirit in the Old, in erecting the fabric of Christian doctrine. In this view, compare Rom. x. 18, with the LXX. and the Hebrew of Ps. xix. 5; and Heb. xi. 21, with Gen. xlviii. 15; and Rom. ii. 24, with Isa. iii. 5, and S. John v. 28; and 1 Cor. xv. 52, with Isa. xxvi. 19. In the last two instances, the great solemnity of the occasions on which the quotation or reference is made makes it more remarkable than common that a version differing from the original should be adopted: the words of our Lord, *οἱ νεκροὶ οἱ ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις*, and those of S. Paul, *οἱ νεκροὶ ἐγερθήσονται*, were doubtless employed as being 'written in their law,' who were addressed; very solemn, therefore, is the interest they impart to the particular version of that law in which they would seem to have originated. And so of other instances which might be alleged. But the particular purpose for which we are most anxious that the Septuagint should be consulted and studied is, as we have already intimated, for the sake of its immediate bearing on the phraseology of the New Testament; '*ad penitius cognoscendam Novi Fœderis phrasin ac dictionem*,' as Carpzov expresses it. This brings us back, at length, to Salmasius and his ἑρμηνευτικὸς λόγος. The rationale of his applying that name to the language of the New Testament is obvious. The writing of the LXX. Version of the Old Testament created the peculiar phraseology in which the New Testament is written. True, there were other sources and influences which supplied and moulded that phraseology,—as study of Greek authors, classical or unclassical, national peculiarity, and the like. But as to its essence, its *differentia*, the term ἑρμηνευτικὸς, 'the interpretative tongue,' describes with accuracy the character of the language. However, Salmasius has provided for the recognition of the more accidental element, if desired; the entire name he would give is, the ἰδιωτικὸς καὶ ἑρμηνευτικὸς λόγος; which, were it not for an awkward association, might be rendered the *privato-interpretative*.

---

[1] Vide Tracts for the Times, vol. iii., and Palmer's Origines Liturgicæ, vol. i.

Let it be clearly understood in what sense it is meant that the writers of the New Testament used the language created by the translators of the Old. Not in the same way as a purist in style copies some master or model, by a conscious act of imitation. The case before us is different from this. We have the Hebrew nation, first of all, greatly un-Hebraized by the captivity; and thus the way prepared for the influx of a Greek element after their return. This element comes in the person of Alexander, and is perpetuated in that of the Ptolemys and the Antiochuses. From the hour that Alexander recognised in the high-priest Jaddua the figure which had years before beckoned him in a vision to the East,—from that hour, Greek domination coloured the whole fortunes, phraseology, writing of the Hebrews. Then comes in the LXX Version to stereotype, in a great measure, the forms of phraseology thus engendered. Its composition extends, for certain, over a space of a hundred years: for the books of the Prophets were not translated, as we have seen, until about 180 B.C. That the stream of Greek theological phraseology thus formed continued to within a very short time of the writing of the New Testament, the apocryphal writings come in to prove. The 1 Maccabees, and the Wisdom of Solomon, written in the end of the second century B.C.;[1] Ecclesiasticus, about 100 B.C.;[2] 1 Esdras probably about the Christian era, for it is quoted by Josephus—are sufficient indications that the new 'fount of types,' cast, as it were, by the Alexandrine interpreters, continued to be used for the purposes of writing and teaching among the Jews up to the time when the Canon of the New Testament commences. While, therefore, the Aramæan appears to have been the spoken vernacular of the nation at that time, the customary vehicle of written teaching was the peculiar form of Greek which we find in the LXX, with such modifications as time or separate nationality had imparted to it. In the main, however, that version was no less than their very lexicon and source of vocabulary. The mode in which all the principal and most frequently recurring words and expressions of the Hebrew Scriptures should be rendered, had been there, for the most part, unalterably fixed. 'Altar,' and 'sin,' and 'vessel,' and 'sacrifice,' and 'covenant,' and a thousand other words which might conceivably have been rendered in various ways, had had their proper and inalienable vocables assigned them. Θυσιαστήριον, and not βωμός: ἁμαρτία and not πλημμέλημα: σκεῦος, and not ἄγγος: θυσία and not ἱερεῖον, had become the accredited form under which the Hebrew originals were represented. It were endless to point out the variety of ways in which the language of the LXX. throws light on that of the New Testament; we would refer the reader on this head, to Michaelis' *De usu LXX. interpretum in Nov. Test.*, and to Carpzov's preface, x. 3, and Pearson's *Prefatiò parænetica.* We shall content ourselves with setting down, out of a single chapter of the LXX. taken at random, the words which we at once recognise as familiar to us in the New Testament writers, and which may fairly be considered to have been dictated, so to speak, by the former to the latter:—Gen. xix. 1. ἄγγελοι· ἐξανέστη· εἰς συνάντησιν· προσεκύνησε. 2. καταλύσατε· νίψασθε τοὺς πόδας. 3. ἀζύμους. 4. κοιμηθῆναι· περιεκύκλωσαν· ἅπας ὁ λαός. 9. παροικεῖν· κρίσιν κρίνειν· κακώσωμεν· παρεβιάζοντο· ἤγγισαν συντρίψαι· τὴν θύραν ἀπέκλεισαν. 13. κραυγή. 15. ὄρθρος. 16. ἐταράχθησαν· ἐκράτησαν τῆς χειρός. 17. σώζων . . ψυχήν· εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω· ἐν τῇ περιχώρῳ· εἰς τὸ ὄρος. 21. ἐθαύμασα πρόσωπον. 26. ἐπέβλεψεν. 27. ὤρθρισε· πρωΐ. 28. καμίνου. 29. ἐξαπέστειλε, &c. &c. And the same result will follow, more or less, if any other chapter be looked through with the same view.

---

[1] Burton, Bampton Lectures, III. p. 73.

[2] Ibid. p. 70, note 27.

One or two remarks naturally suggest themselves on what has been said. First, that we surely ought thankfully to receive and turn to good account, the link thus divinely provided between the Old Scriptures and the New. The gap between them is bridged over; the transition from the Law to the Gospel, from Malachi to S. Matthew, is smoothed for us. Greek had already Hebraized long before it was called upon to evangelize. It came with a commission to evolve the mysteries and meanings of the elder dispensation; and it had already taken familiar knowledge of the things appertaining to that dispensation. The 'continuity between the Jewish and Christian Churches'[1] was here provided with a basis of language. The phraseology of the two covenants blends into one harmonious whole. It will, perhaps, be seen from these remarks, what answer we should give to the question, whether we are here recommending the study of the LXX. as *a substitute* for that of the Hebrew Text? We answer, By no means. A complete Biblical scholar should know the two Testaments in their respective languages, and use the Septuagint as a junction line between them. Only, where Hebrew is out of the question—and in practice it has been so, for the clergy at large, time immemorial,—there, the LXX. will do much towards supplying the want—it will give the student some idea of what the character of the unknown original text is. A second remark we have to make is, that the LXX. Version, taking the place it does towards the New Testament Scriptures, furnishes the remedy for a certain infelicity attaching to that study of classical authors, which in itself we so justly value as an instrument of education. The infelicity is this,—that we sit down to the study of the New Testament in Greek, fresh from the style and language of poets, philosophers, and historians, and with an idea of Greek derived from them exclusively. Almost every word we meet with, unless, indeed, it chance to be entirely new to us, comes clothed, in our idea, in the dress of some classical association, of which we find some difficulty in divesting it. But the LXX. Version presents Greek to us under another association, and the very one under which we are glad to meet it. Greek has trod the soil, and breathed the air, and caught the costume and the tone, of 'the glorious land.' Its words and phrases have made new associations for themselves, and are recognised denizens of their adopted country.

---

[1] Newman, Sermons on Subjects of the Day.

> Atque adeo hoc argumentum Græcissat, tamen
> *Non Atticissat, verum Sicilicissitat.*[1]

Once more. We have already had occasion to mention the apocryphal books: and it will be seen at once, from the position which they occupy, that the study of them, too, must be a valuable auxiliary to that of the New Testament. Place them as high or as low in date as you will—bring what doctrinal objections against them you may,—still, no ingenuity can prevent their taking their place as a nearly contemporary collection of Græco-Jewish didactic writings. Whether the writers of the New Testament had seen them, or any of them, or not, it is undeniable that kindred forms of thought and expression to those of the New Testament are to be found in them, to a degree which can be predicated of no other body of Greek writings. For example:—whatever Platonic forms of philosophy or speech S. Paul or S. John may be thought to have recognised and turned to divine uses, here is a pretty ample storehouse of them.[2] There are strong indications, again, of

---

[1] Plaut. Menœchmi, Prolog. ii.

[2] *Vide* Burton, Bampton Lect., *ubi supra, sqq.*

S. James having written his Epistle with no reference to some particular ethical system, in which virtues and duties were classified in a particular manner, or associated with each other by their occurrence in a particular line of teaching. Nothing else can account for the rapid transitions from the mention of one duty to another not visibly connected with it. A reference to the book of Ecclesiasticus solves the phenomenon—exhibits the self-same concatenation of virtues, and supplies the line of thought on which they are strung together. (Compare S. James i. 2—12 with Ecclus. i. ii. throughout; both, of course, in the original Greek.) Whether S. James was acquainted with such system through the medium of that book or not, is indifferent; it is just as likely to have been the popular ethical system of the day: it is enough that it fits exactly into the intricacies we find in the arrangement of that Epistle, unlocks it, and exhibits its contents under a regular and systematic form. We have only to add on the subject of the LXX. Version, a few remarks on the best method of studying it with the particular end in view of which we have been speaking. It will at once be seen that nothing but a regular and patient use of such a help can answer the desired purpose. We do not grow all at once into a scholar-like insight into the excellences and beauties of the classical writers; such insight is the growth of years, or however, of long acquaintance. And even so must the LXX. Version have been for some time our companion, before the full extent of its bearing on our studies of the New Testament is felt. We would suggest the constant use of it in the private reading of the Old Testament; and that, to be effective, should be followed up by a careful noting of such forms of expression as seem capable of illustrating the text of the New Testament. And conversely, in reading the latter critically, no pains should be spared in thoroughly sifting the LXX. usages which appear in any case to be adopted. Now this was formerly a laborious task, the field of the Version being so wide, that it was difficult indeed to be certain that one had not overlooked any important illustration. The Concordances of Kircherus and Trommius, and the LXX. Lexicon of Schleusner, are indeed valuable helps: but even with their assistance, much pains and discrimination are needed, to turn the contents of the Septuagint to account. We rejoice therefore that we are able to direct the student to a modern work, by which the process of exhaustive inquiry is immensely simplified. We allude to one of the noblest theological labours of our age, the '*Editio Hellenistica*' of the New Testament, by Mr. Grinfield: the title of which appears at the head of our article. For 'improbus labor' it rivals the Kircheri and the Trommii of past generations, even as it at present stands: had the learned and indefatigable editor been able to complete it, by adding to it his projected threefold collation of the Hebrew, LXX., and New Testament,[1] it would have been a monument worthy to be placed side by side with Brian Walton, and Origen. '*Per decem annos*,' he informs us in his touching and most religious preface, '*Per decem annos in hâc Editione conficiendâ operam studiumque impensè elocavi.*' We should not omit to add, that this brief but pregnant account of his labours is followed by the expression of a most modest appreciation of them. The plan of the work is simple, but most admirable. The New Testament text is printed entire, and to each verse is appended all that is to be found, either in the LXX. or the Apocrypha, illustrative of it. The versions of Theodotion, Symmachus, and Aquila, and the writings of Philo and Josephus, are also laid under contribution occasionally. Here, then, are not only collected together, but digested into the most convenient order for use, all those excellent materials for sacred study, which the one great body of writings kindred to the New Testament so richly supplies. We trust that no words of ours will be needed to recommend the work to the student. We do not promise him that it will do away with the necessity of labour on his own part, but it will diminish it by fully one-half, making the study which it designs to forward both easy and delightful.

5. We have found ourselves obliged to enter at such length into the subject of LXX. study, that we must be more brief than we had intended to be upon other departments. It is clear, however, that for the critical study of the Inspired Text, generically the same helps are requisite as for the text of a profane author. Now, the genera of these helps may be reduced to three:—works of vocabulary, of syntax, and works of general illustration. Vocabulary is the first want of the reader of a new language. We have already, by recommending the study of the LXX., indicated one very ample source of New Testament vocabulary. Much, however, will, of course, still remain to be done, for which a Lexicon will be needed. Many valuable criticisms are, no doubt, to be found scattered in the more ponderous general Lexicons of Scapula, Constantinus, &c.; but a Lexicon specifically designed to assist the student of the New Testament is almost a requisite. And the older vocabularies of this sort—the Hesychius, and Suidas, and Phavorinus, whose glosses, often so hopelessly obscure, taxed the

---

[1] Those who appreciate these learned labours, will read with regret the following announcement, contained in the preface, of the unavoidable abandonment of this admirable design: 'Utinam talem editionem τῶν O', huic gemellam, nobis instruere datum esset! Sed volenti vires naturæ deficiunt, et anni senescentes nobis tam ardua, quam vis desideranda, recusant,' p. x.

patience and ingenuity of our forefathers, have, we need not say, been fully ransacked to furnish forth the more convenient compendiums of our own day. These last, however, call for some caution and discrimination in the use of them; and, we confess, we could not with much satisfaction have handed the tyro over to the fanciful mysticism of Parkhurst, or the more reckless and dangerous 'science' of Schleusner, Bretschneider, and Wahl, unaccompanied by any stricture on the objectionable parts of their writings. Happily, the honoured name of Hugh James Rose has established this claim, in addition to many others, on our gratitude, that he has left us a Lexicon on the basis of Parkhurst's, but omitting his puerilities, and embodying also such parts of Schleusner as are sound and valuable; thus rescuing at once the otherwise creditable work of his own countryman from the contempt into which it had necessarily fallen, and drawing the Rationalistic fangs of the continental interpreters.

The grammar and syntax of the New Testament is a subject which has been hitherto, for the most part, infelicitously handled. Writers have chosen to arrange themselves into two factions, the one obstinately maintaining, the other denying, the purity of the style. Hence, instead of candid inquirers into the matter of fact, we have generally had grammarians *θέσιν διαφυλάττοντες*, too anxious about the theory they had espoused to be safe guides. The real question is, What are the usages we find in the text? if, in any instance, they are obviously irreconcilable with Attic correctness, it is in vain to seek to explain them away; nor is there any object in so doing. Each passage must be examined by itself, and by itself stand or fall. What approximation the language thus examined may be found to make, as a whole, to the Attic, or any other standard, is a matter of secondary importance. A grammar of the New Testament dialect proceeding on this principle, has, at length, appeared on English ground; and we heartily commend it to the notice and use of the student, as no less meritorious in execution, than correct in point of design and plan. We allude to Mr. Green's treatise, named at the head of this article. We do not hesitate to speak of it as a work of the highest merit, even considered as a treatise on grammar in general; and, as a key to the grammatical peculiarities of the New Testament, it is without a rival. For clearness, both of thought and expression, for philosophical accuracy and terseness of definition, for compression and comprehension, this modest and unpretending volume is truly admirable. The subjects of 'the article,' and of 'particles of design,' those knotty questions of sacred criticism, are very successfully treated, and for the most part, as we conceive, set definitively at rest. Bishop Middleton's work on the article may still continue to be read with interest as a meritorious essay, and he will ever have the great credit of having been the first to reduce the subject to a system; but the sounder definitions and theory of Mr. Green must render his work the text-book, henceforth, of the philosophical and accurate scholar. The worthy bishop had one great literary defect; he did not know when he was beaten. Hence, whenever his theory is at fault, as oftentimes it is, he sets up the most absurd defences; and in no one instance, that we remember, does he fairly give in, and confess that his theorem fails. From this cause, his book, useful as it is in piloting the student where all is tolerably plain sailing, utterly fails to bring him through any formidable straits whatsoever. Again, the rationalizing conclusions which Rosenmüller and others have built upon the allegation, that particles of design, in such passages as ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τοῦ προφητοῦ κ. τ. λ. are used ἐκβατικῶς merely, will find their best answer in the calm and temperate discussion here bestowed upon them. On some minor points, we should differ in view from the writer, but they are chiefly matters rather of detail than of principle.

It only remains to speak of works of general illustration; and the consideration of these will very suitably bring to a close an article which will appear, at first sight, to recommend a somewhat confined line of study, with a view to the Greek text of the New Testament. While, however, it has confessedly been our object to prevail upon the student to adopt a very direct, and even matter-of-fact method of critical study, we by no means wish to exclude from view altogether many sources of illustration besides those we have mentioned; and we will now explain what place we would give to them. What we aim at, then, in the revolution which we would ain bring about in New Testament study in the original, is not, by any means, to discourage breadth and variety of research, but to secure that depth and solidity on which alone these can safely be based. Illustrative reading presupposes something to be illustrated; collateral reading, some principal line for it to run parallel to; and *that* something must be a rightly-directed, methodical, and critical study of the Sacred Text in the original. Let this be forthcoming, and stand firmly up as the *stamen*, the 'warp' of the web of theological study, and there is no limit to the amount of *subtemen*, 'woof' of every texture and colour, which may with advantage be worked into it. All that is then needed, is discrimination in the choice of materials. Here, then, will come in with admirable effect, the results of all chance and occasional theological reading, such as every student must more or less be led into. The writings of Fathers, however unsystematically and *pro re natâ* studied, will now render up ample and *available* illustration, for we shall know where to place it. And our perusal of later works will teem with precious fragments of criticism in like manner, not now floating vaguely and without purpose, but ever tending towards one central line, and forming and crystallizing about it. The habit of noting and recording such illustrative passages, cannot be too highly commended: an interleaved copy of the Greek text supplies the readiest means of carrying it into practice. By this means, the student will find, after a while, that, in George Herbert's words, 'he hath compiled a book, and body of divinity,' and will fully acknowledge the truth of what the same revered though quaint authority adds on the subject, viz., that 'though the world is full of such composures, yet every man's own is fittest, readiest, and most savoury to him.' We cannot pretend to sketch anything like an exact scheme of reading, with a view to such a 'composure,' and must content ourselves with the suggestion of some principles of selection, and the enumeration of a few works which may be recommended for their bearing on particular parts of the Sacred Text. As a general rule, then, we would repeat our caution against 'running commentaries;' a 'commentarius perpetuus' is very apt to be a 'perpetual' clog upon our apprehension of the text: set treatises are a far more valuable kind of criticism. And while recognising as splendid exceptions the 'Catena Aurea' of S. Thomas Aquinas, long since translated as a companion to the Library of the Fathers, the 'Catena Patrum Græcorum,' edited by Dr. Cramer, and Theodoret's 'Commentary on the Epistles,' we would deprecate any exclusive use of even these,—any leaning upon them as all-sufficient guides. Euthymius Zigabenus, a Constantinopolitan monk, has left us a useful compendium of the earlier catenæ. On particular parts of the New Testament we would mention—on the Gospels generally, Mr. Isaac Williams's now well-known volume, and, with some reservation, of course, the Commentaries of Olshausen; on the earlier history of our Lord's life and ministry, Williams's 'Nativity;' Dr. Mill on the two first chapters of S. Luke; on S. Mark, the Greek Catena, (*ut supra*, supposed to be by S. Cyril of Alexandria,) as of especial beauty; on S. John's Gospel, Euthymius (*ut supra*); on the Epistles generally, Theodoret (*ut supra*); on the Epistle to the Romans, Bull's Harmonia and Examen (*i.e.* 'on Justification'); we know no commentary on it of equal value, after S. Chrysostom, who, of course, should be studied, if leisure permit, both for S. Matthew and the Romans. On the other Epistles, we know of no one modern book that can be commended; it is a want which we have already incidentally noticed. Finally, on the Apocalypse, Dr. Todd's

Lectures, as clearing the subject from a host of conflicting theories, and at least opening the way to the sounder interpretations of the earliest ages.

With these suggestions, we take our leave of the subject. We have studiously confined ourselves—not without an effort, not without risk of seeming to ignore the great truths, that holiness and prayer are, after all, the golden keys of sacred mysteries,—to the merely critical aspect of the sublime study of which we have been writing. But, in truth, we trust and thankfully believe, that deeper stirrings than our feeble pen is master of have for some time past been awakening scholar and sage alike, within the bosom of our own Church, to those awful and reverential regards for holy things and words, to which alone we should, without trembling, commit the critical study of the written word. We shall be abundantly satisfied if but to a single student thus minded we have smoothed the pathway to the fountains of revealed truth; and proportionately grieved if we should prove the means of leading any to approach them in a hard, cold, and merely critical spirit.

Art. II.—1. *The Poets and Poetry of America.* *By* Rufus Willmot Griswold. Philadelphia.

2. *Poems.* *By* William Cullen Bryant. Philadelphia.

3. *Poems.* *By* N. Parker Willis. Philadelphia.

4. *Poems.* *By* Ralph Waldo Emerson. London: Chapman, Brothers.

It is a truth which applies as fully to poetry as to other arts, "that whatever is to be truly great and affecting, must have in it the strong stamp of the native land; and this not of a law, but of necessity, from the intense hold on their country of the affections of all truly great men." Shakspeare is English; no denizen of any other country could have written a page of his plays. Dante is Italian; intensely Florentine. Schiller is German; Tegner is Swedish. The recognition of this nationality in all original minds is one of the pleasures of extensive reading, and of a large acquaintance with foreign literature. It gives a zest to every French *chanson*, that it is so thoroughly French; to a Spanish ballad, that it could not have been written out of Spain, away from the chivalry and the turmoil of its old intestine wars. It is the charm of Burns's Scotch scenery, his delineations of character, grave and gay, that they so vividly bring Scotland and the Scotch before us. Citizens of the world are not poets, though the extended sympathies implied in the term have their uses and advantages in other callings. The dreams and visions, the glories and illusions of youth—the faith, the history, the traditions of his country, the worship of native hills, and groves, and streams, linger by the poet all his life long. With mankind at large, these impressions fade before new, and therefore stronger, interests. But the poet is for ever looking back; he never loses his childhood; he does not let the past slip away from him, but gathers up the years as they fall, and is child, and youth, and man, all in one. And childhood is best remembered, and the earliest impressions are the deepest. Walter Scott, in the last failing year of his life, murmured of Tweed and Yarrow, of the sports and the traditions of his youth, in sight of the magnificence of Italian landscape and association; for what is country but home, and home glorified in the poet's dream—what is it, but his most living and glowing type of heaven?

In our own continent, however, each language has been the slow product of the thoughts of its people. A thousand local circumstances give it its peculiar genius, and every national tongue insensibly adapts itself to express, with the greatest accuracy and perfection, the prevailing feelings and principles it is called upon to clothe and develope. In attempting some notice of the Poetry of America, we must not forget that the Americans have not the advantage of a language founded on those peculiar ideas of republicanism and freedom of thought which form their boast and pride. But a short time has elapsed since they were first an independent people, and they have to express their national sentiments in a tongue whose structure little sympathizes with them,—in a tongue whose foundations were laid in the feudal ages, which has been built up in a profound reverence for forms and creeds, for kings and rulers, which has been strengthened and buttressed by rigid philosophy and severe dogmatic divinity, and decorated by the ornaments of fancy, chivalry, gallantry, and pastoral graces which successive ages brought with them. It is with this engine, and their taste formed on this literature, that our neighbours have to express unfettered liberty, uncontrolled will, freedom of opinion, and independence of conscience. It is hardly to be wondered at that they should feel themselves hampered and clogged in their powers of expression on their favourite themes, that their eagle should soar with unsteady wing, that 'Liberty' herself should be checked in the bray of her trumpet-tones by the uncongenial order and sweetness of her too harmonious instrument. It may be too early to look for it, but we think it will readily be admitted that, as yet, America has formed no new phase, has given no fresh transatlantic grace to our common tongue. The language is often very excellent English—nervous, elegant, expressive English—but we do not find any foreign graces, any original collocation of words of which we can say, 'This is American,' as in reviewing our own literature we can pronounce, 'This is Elizabethan,' or this is of the chivalrous tone of Charles the First's time, or this belongs clearly to the so-called Augustan age. Neither in the constitution of their language, nor in any point but one, on which we shall soon touch, do we recognise nationality in the great body of American poets. They all *mean* to be national; they are *patriotic*. They talk of liberty, and Washington, and Bunker's hill, with an admirable repetition and perseverance; but the celebration of these circumstances of their country's pride does not constitute that strong stamp of the native land which we have wished to define as giving to the universal poetry of a country its national characteristics, and which, in the way we mean, shows itself as much in a love-song as in a hymn of victory. There are, as we have already intimated, abundant causes and excuses for this. Europe must possess too strong an attraction; all history, all romance centres in it. Beyond the magnificence and beauty of her natural scenery, her interminable forests and untrodden plains, her glorious autumn hues, what does America possess worthy to fill a poet's heart, or to educate his spirit?—we speak of what is commonly understood with us by America—the United States. No Church, no settled creed, no antiquities, no history, we may almost say no forefathers; no heroes but the much-boasted pilgrim-fathers, no predecessors but savages,—pilgrims and savages resembling each other in this, that eyes must shut themselves somewhat wilfully against the truth to see in either of them a fit theme for poetic enthusiasm. In the destitution of objects or events to feed the fancy upon, we ought not, perhaps, to consider the existence of the red man as a misfortune to the American imaginative faculty. Whatever is to be found in nature, poetry ought to be able to adapt to her purposes and to make her own. Yet we believe all European readers of American poetry must weary of the perpetual recurrence of feathered, wampum-belted, painted chiefs, either with their natural accompaniments of abject squaws and bloody tomahawks, or their romantic ones of long-haired maidens, the hunter's toil, and the blissful repose of the wigwam. There must be sameness in all such delineations, for savages are pourtrayed by their species, not as individual characters. They may be described as either fighting or in repose, as Landseer may paint the same lion under these opposing circumstances; but we see through all changes the same red-man. We never get to know one from another. We pity these unfortunates when they are driven from their haunts, we shrink from them when they dance and yell over a fallen enemy, we wonder at their tastes, we are amazed at the sagacity of their instincts; but we are too far removed from them in habits of thought and action really to care for them. For ourselves, we must confess that the pale weaver at his frame, or the collier black from his mine, is to our mind a more interesting object for the fancy and heart to dwell on, than the sternest, boldest, most erect savage that ever marked down his enemy from behind a tree. Still we may admit that savages, as features of the scene, as giving at once life and wildness to our ideas of a primeval forest—as contrasts to the settlers who eventually drive them from their home, have a certain picturesque effect; it is the prominence given to them of which alone we complain. If we could ever find them in these poems, which may soon be their only record, yielding to the influences of religion and believing its truths, then another and a deeper chord of our sympathies would be struck; our interests would be legitimately awakened. The early settlers, however, had not a missionary spirit,—they thought more of exterminating their dangerous neighbours than converting them. We have many a bloody battle recorded, many a deed of treachery on either side, many a lovely peaceful scene profaned by a tradition of cold-blooded murder and revenge. Such are the scenes of action and passion that American annals present to her poets and novelists. After making what they can of these two forms of the poetic and heroic, they commonly turn to the old world for further inspiration. European poetry is their model; old turns of thought, old illustrations, old fancies,—all learnt in the study, not the nursery, and of which their native land bears no trace,—their resource. And so we have fairy-land over again, and Swiss mountaineers, and Greek exiles, and songs after the manner of the seventeenth century, and chivalry and romance with a sort of especial impossibility thrown over them, and a temporary adoption of a sterner and more positive creed than their country teaches or their heart desires—a kind of literary ecclesiastical costume.

What we say applies to the body of American poets, as we see them in Mr. Griswold's very extensive selection from their works. We shall, of course, have occasion very much to modify such a general expression of opinion when we come to consider the claims and powers of individuals; and we feel it is not fair to pursue the subject further without the admission that one poet at least our neighbours have, who *is* national in the fullest sense of the word, who is an American or nothing; whose sense of beauty has been fostered amidst those illimitable forests, those green savannahs, those glorious streams; who has an eye or a heart for nothing else; whose religion and whose politics cannot look beyond his country; who sees in republicanism all greatness and every source of perfection, and in independency and liberalism all that is true in religion; who believes the elements themselves to be opposed to the old world—making the winds play their pranks upon our roofs and tiles—and the "sea, with its restless surges, eating away the shores of earth's old continents;" who cannot speak, however incidentally, of kings, but "tyrant" goes before as an epithet, nor name the word priest, but with allusions to hypocrisy and oppression. Alas that the true poetic germ should be planted in a soil so uncongenial for its free and full development—that a nation's faults should blot so fair a page! Yet, in face of these, William Cullen Bryant *is* a poet, a poet of whom his country or any country may be proud—faithful to his vocation—honest, pure, and true. He has written many lines which, perhaps, we would wish blotted out, but none of which, with his opinions, he need be ashamed. Ignorance or prejudice makes him often unjust, but he never goes against his conscience, never profanes verse by the expression of mean, or vain, or voluptuous thought. We may not approve of what glimpses we have of his theology; but he is always reverent, and, according to his light, religious. He has vain expectations of progress, and hopes which the Gospel does not warrant; but the true lessons of nature he takes seriously to heart—they make him, in spite of republican pride, gentle, kind, charitable, compassionate. He may hate the middle age, but he loves his neighbour; for nature has been the most loved as well as the truest teacher. Liberalism has pervaded his understanding, but God's works have taught his heart. Under a more catholic system he would indeed have been a poet in a wider sense; the heart of man would have been open to him as truly as the fair page of creation—but now we cannot trust him, either to look backwards or forwards; we cannot follow his reasoning on the past, nor share in his hopes and expectations for the future. He is no seer, his vision does not reach farther than other men's; but what lies before him he does understand, and draws true and sound lessons from. He reads the moral of nature, and we profit by his teaching.

One of many such lessons we are tempted to quote here, to illustrate our meaning. If it is already familiar to some of our readers, we must ask them to bear with it, as with the repetition of some sweet old melody, for very sweet and melodious we think it.

TO A WATER-FOWL.

'WHITHER, 'midst falling dew,
While glow the heavens with the last steps of day,
Far, through their rosy depths, dost thou pursue
Thy solitary way?

Vainly the fowler's eye
Might mark thy distant flight to do thee wrong,
As, darkly painted on the crimson sky,
Thy figure floats along.

Seek'st thou the plashy brink
Of weedy lake, or marge of river wide?
Or where the rocking billows rise and sink
On the chafed ocean side?

There is a Power whose care
Teaches thy way along that pathless coast,—
The desert and illimitable air,—
Lone wandering but not lost.

All day thy wings have fanned,
At that far height, the cold, thin atmosphere,
Yet stoop not, weary, to the welcome land,
Though the dark night is near.

And soon that toil shall end;
Soon shalt thou find a summer home, and rest,
And scream among thy fellows; reeds shall bend,
Soon, o'er thy sheltered nest.

Thou'rt gone, the abyss of heaven
Hath swallowed up thy form; yet on my heart
Deeply hath sunk the lesson thou hast given,
And shall not soon depart.

He who from zone to zone,
Guides through the boundless sky thy certain flight,
In the long way that I must tread alone,
Will lead my steps aright.'

The reeds, the plashy brink, the sheltered nest, the social screaming company!—we feel able, under such a guide, to comprehend and sympathize with all the joys a bird is capable of; and as our eye follows that lone wanderer, we, too, share the poet's hope.

As a contrast to these serene musings, we will next show our poet as an historian and prophet. The following lines are taken from a 'Poem on the Ages.' They give his view of the middle ages, or rather the whole period between the original propagation of the gospel, and the renaissance—some fourteen hundred years.

'Vainly that ray of darkness from above
That shone around the Galilean lake,
The light of hope, the leading star of love,
Struggled, the darkness of that day to break;
Even its own faithless guardians strove to slake
In fogs of earth the pure immortal flame;
And priestly hands, for Jesu's blessed sake,
Were red with blood, and charity became,
In that stern war of forms, a mockery and a name.

They triumphed, and less bloody rites were kept
Within the quiet of the convent cell;
The well-fed inmates pattered prayer, and slept,
And sinned, and liked their easy penance well.
Where pleasant was the spot for men to dwell,
Amid its fair broad lands the abbey lay,
Sheltering dark orgies that were shame to tell;
And cowled and barefoot beggars swarmed the way,
All in their convent weeds, of black, and white, and grey.'

It is painful, amid many beauties, to which we hope to return, to present our readers with another example of what may be called our author's patriotic style; but it is necessary in order to give a correct idea of a true American poet. Liberty there, is not at all the quiet household divinity she is content to be with us, but the most exacting of goddesses, for ever demanding hymns and holocausts, and seeking to intoxicate her worshippers.

If ever our present author is obscure, it is on this theme. Experience soon teaches his readers to foretel its approach. For a stanza or two, we lose ourselves in high-sounding words, and miss the truthfulness and sobriety which are his ordinary characteristics. Thus heralded, out leaps the monster amid thrones, sceptered throngs, and fetters, struggles, terrors, lashes, and crouching slaves, all supposed to infest European, and even our English shores, little aware as we are of our degradation, and even possibly disposed to think some of these hard words more applicable to a newer world, where the lash is no mere metaphor, and 'slave' is more than an ugly and offensive epithet. The following stanzas are the conclusion of the same poem, and convey his hopes and expectations for his country, and the world at large, which, perhaps, he would think the present moment is accomplishing.

'Here the free spirit of mankind, at length,
Throws its last fetters off; and who shall place
A limit to the giant's unchained strength,
Or cast his swiftness in the forward race?
Far, like the comet's way through infinite space,
Stretches the long untravelled path of light,
Into the depth of ages: we may trace,
Distant, the brightening glory of its flight,
Till the receding rays are lost to human sight.

Europe is given a prey to sterner fates,
And writhes in shackles; strong the arms that chain
To earth her struggling multitude of states;
She, too, is strong, and might not chafe in vain
Against them, but might cast to earth the train
That trample her, and break their iron net.
Yes, she shall look on brighter days, and gain
The meed of worthier deeds; the moment set
To rescue and raise up, draws near—but is not yet.

But thou, my country, thou shalt never fall,
Save with thy children—thy maternal care,
Thy lavish love, thy blessings showered on all—
These are thy fetters—seas and stormy air
Are the wide barrier of thy borders, where,
Among thy gallant sons that guard thee well,
Thou laugh'st at enemies: who shall then declare
The date of thy deep-founded strength, or tell
How happy in thy lap the sons of men shall dwell?'

Many a wise man, however, does not manifest his wisdom in soaring above the prejudices of his own times and circumstances. We are inclined, indeed, to believe that those who most commonly earn this praise, are such as abide by the system they were educated in; their wisdom consisting in making the best of it. They may take for granted its errors, or even uphold them, but they are guided by its truths; these influence their mind and heart. In spite, then, of national prepossessions and antipathies which offend, and aspirations which we can neither share nor sympathize in, we cannot rise from an attentive perusal of Bryant's collected poems without the persuasion that we have been holding pleasant communion with a wise, thoughtful, and original mind. He may be boastful and arrogant for his country, he may foresee for her uninterrupted success and unfading glory, but, for himself, he has learnt a far different lesson; whatever may be a favoured nation's destiny, he feels that for each man that composes it there is a fate of unfulfilled wishes and disappointed hopes, a brilliant opening, a dark retrospect—that life ends before one high purpose is realized: and he sees that it is good that it should be so. We have given in our first extract, the lines to 'The Water-fowl,' one of the earliest of his published poems; the following, on 'The Waning Moon,' bearing out, as we believe, what has been said, may be called his last. A period of nearly thirty years lies between them; more than time enough to teach such a lesson.

THE WANING MOON.

'I've watched too late; the morn is near;
One look at God's broad silent sky!
Oh, hopes and wishes vainly dear,
How in your very strength ye die!

Even while your glow is on your cheek,
And scarce the high pursuit begun,
The heart grows faint, the hand grows weak,
The task of life is left undone.

See where upon the horizon's brim,
Lies the still cloud in gloomy bars;
The waning moon, all pale and dim,
Goes up amid the eternal stars.

Late, in a flood of tender light,
She floated through the ethereal blue,
A softer sun, that shone all night
Upon the gathering beads of dew.

And still thou wanest, pallid moon!
The encroaching shadow grows apace;
Heaven's everlasting watchers soon
Shall see thee blotted from thy place.

Oh, Night's dethroned and crownless queen!
Well may thy sad expiring ray
Be shed on those whose eyes have seen
Hope's glorious visions fade away.

Shine thou for forms that once were bright,
For sages in the mind's eclipse,
For those whose words were spells of might,
But falter now on stammering lip!

In thy decaying beam there lies
Full many a grave on hill and plain,
Of those who closed their dying eyes
In grief that they had lived in vain.

Another night, and thou among
The spheres of heaven shall cease to shine,
All rayless in the glittering throng
Whose lustre late was quenched in thine.

Yet soon a new and tender light
From out thy darkened orb shall beam,
And broaden till it shines all night
On glistening dew and glimmering stream.'—*Bryant*, p. 359.

The peculiar poetic power of this author, however, lies in the description of nature; and this may be considered a national gift; an admission which is certainly due, after what has been said on the subject of nationality. For not only do the more distinguished American writers excel in this—and Bryant with a peculiar fidelity and grace—but few whose works are thought worthy of a place in the national collection but have written some felicitous suggestive lines, which strike upon the mind's eye like a picture. The poetic instinct must needs in all states of the world take its possessors out of doors into the solitude and loveliness of nature; but especially in a land where nature has done so much, and where, as yet, the genius of man shows so little to excite the contemplative dreamy vein. In the old world, art, or man's doings, divide the picturesque with nature; and even have no unworthy part, small though the share may be, in the higher, more sublime element of Beauty. But in America, by the tacit confession of its writers, we must look for those graces and glories in the works of creation alone. Art, as yet, has had no reign; a new nation is too busy for such matters; and Time has not mellowed the homely and common into his own chastened loveliness. The eye that longs for beauty,— the heart that desires repose,— the memory that would fain search into the past,—the weariness which yearns for rest as the great good, are all driven to seek what they long for by woods and shady streams. Every traveller and describer of American life and manners, friendly or angry, agrees in giving to them one aspect;— ceaseless bustle, hurry, excitement, labour, progress; one rushing, impetuous stream of life; a universal reaching after advancement, wealth and distinction. Man has, hitherto, built no resting-places; no homes for quieter tastes or higher aims. Such, therefore, must of force wander forth, and pour out their hearts beneath the broad tranquil sky. The sense of refreshment—the unwonted leisure—the contrast of their present ease with the turmoil left behind, all dispose the mind to a fond particularity of investigation. They at once feel the peaceful grandeur of the whole, and are disposed with a loving study to watch every detail—each minute property of bud, and insect, and flower. It is delicious to find *time* for such contemplation, while all the rest of the world is so busy,—it is happiness simply to let the hours go by uncounted. Thus, in no poetry do we find more frequent allusions to the charms of idleness,—from mere repose of body, to utter oblivion and unconsciousness of mind.

'In order to see nature in all her grandeur,' says Humboldt, in his Kosmos, 'it is necessary to present her under a two-'fold aspect; first objectively, as an actual phenomenon, and 'next as reflected in the feelings of mankind.' Of these two modes, that which is essentially American (though her poets are not without that other power) is the first. Their skill lies in portraying what they see with vividness and accuracy. They place before us a true and faithful picture,—such a fresh, green, sunshiny piece of nature as our English landscape-painters delight us with—the dew yet glittering in the morning light. The artist feels what he sees, but does not care to impress himself upon his picture. He calls on us to stand with him, and admire and love what he does. In attempting to illustrate what we mean by examples, we feel to be under a great disadvantage, both because space will not allow us to do so fully, or by extracts of sufficient length; and also, that passages often lose half their beauty thus dislodged from the context, and made to stand forth by themselves with a sort of confident pretension. We have, perhaps, to apologize for the too frequent recurrence of one name in proving a universal accomplishment: but we own him to be our most fruitful source, as well as our leading example.

The following is a picture of calm repose. The profound stillness of the August scene is often dwelt upon by American writers, in contrast with the early summer breezes of June:—

'The quiet August noon has come,
  A slumberous silence fills the sky,
The fields are still, the woods are dumb,
  In glassy sleep the waters lie.

And mark yon soft white clouds that rest
  Above our vale, a moveless throng;
The cattle on the mountain's breast
  Enjoy the grateful shadow long.

* * * * *

Rest here, beneath the unmoving shade,
  And on the silent valleys gaze,
Winding and widening till they fade
  In yon soft ring of summer haze.

The village trees their summits rear
  Still as its spire, and yonder flock
At rest in those calm fields appear
  As chiselled from the lifeless rock.

One tranquil mount the scene o'erlooks,—
  There the hushed winds their sabbath keep,
While a near hum from bees and brooks
  Comes faintly like the breath of sleep.'—*Bryant*, p. 190.

A wide landscape in the confused mist of sunshine is happily brought before us in these few lines:—

'All dim in haze the mountains lay,
  With dimmer vales between:
And rivers glimmered in their way,
  By forests faintly seen;
While ever rose a murmuring sound,
From brooks below and bees around.'

And the gradual ascent of summer vapour, beautifully described in itself, is equally successful in the lesson it teaches:—

'Earth's children cleave to Earth—her frail
  Decaying children dread decay.
Yon wreath of mist that leaves the vale,
  And lessens in the morning ray—
Look how by mountain rivulet
  It lingers as it upward creeps,
And clings to fern and copsewood set
  Along the green and dewy steeps:
Clings to the fragrant kalmia, clings
  To precipices fringed with grass,
Dark maples where the wood-thrush sings,
  And bowers of fragrant sassafras.
Yet all in vain—it passes still
  From hold to hold, it cannot stay,
And in the very beams that fill
  The world with glory, wastes away,
Till, parting from the mountain's brow,
  It vanishes from human eye,
And that which sprung of earth is now
  A portion of the glorious sky.'—P. 298.

His fountains and streams bring always most fresh and pure images before us:—

'Fountain, that springest on this grassy slope,
Thy quick cool murmur mingles pleasantly
With the cool sound of breezes in the beech
Above me in the noontide. Thou dost wear
No stain of thy dark birthplace; gushing up
From the red mould and slimy roots of earth,
Thou flashest in the sun. The mountain air
In winter is not clearer, nor the dew
That shines on mountain blossom. Thus doth God
Bring from the dark and foul, the pure and bright.'
P. 316.

We would gladly transcribe a poem called 'The Rivulet,' *written* on revisiting the stream by which he played in infancy, and which recals so clearly to his readers the sparkle and the ripple of streams associated with their own early recollections; but it is too long for our purpose.

His allusions to flowers are always happy. He is intimate with them, so to say, and knows their times and seasons, and their haunts. He never assembles them together in the impossible groups which so often perplex our fancies in poetry, where the author ought to know nature better. The wind-flower, as coming in early spring, is an especial favourite.

> 'Lodged in sunny cleft,
> Where the cold breezes come not, blooms alone
> The little wind-flower, whose just opened eye
> Is blue as the spring heaven it gazes at—
> Startling the loiterer in the naked groves
> With unexpected beauty, for the time
> Of blossoms and green leaves is yet afar.'—P. 50.

In contrast with this cheerful little image, is the following lament over the decay of the flowers in latest autumn.

> 'The wind-flower and the violet they perished long ago,
> And the briar rose and the orchis died amid the summer-glow;
> But on the hill the golden rod, and the aster in the wood,
> And the yellow sunflower by the brook in autumn beauty stood,
> Till fell the frost from the clear cold heaven, as falls the plague on men,
> And the brightness of their smile was gone from upland glade and glen.
>
> And now when comes the calm, mild day, as still such days will come,
> To call the squirrel and the bee from out their winter home;
> When the sound of dropping nuts is heard, though all the trees are still,
> And twinkle in the smoky light the waters of the rill,
> The south wind searches for the flowers whose fragrance late he bore,
> And sighs to find them in the woods and by the streams no more.'—P. 153.

In that land of summer-heats, the winds are most earnestly invoked by the poets, and their praises sung on all occasions. These lines, descriptive of the gradual rise and stir of the breeze, follow a passage which almost too painfully helps us to realize the intense heat of that less temperate clime.

> 'Why so slow,
> Gentle and voluble spirit of the air?
> Oh! come and breathe upon the fainting earth
> Coolness and life. Is it that in his caves
> He hears me? See, on yonder woody ridge,
> The pine is bending his proud top, and now,
> Among the nearer groves, chestnut and oak
> Are tossing their green boughs about. He comes!
> Lo, where the grassy meadow runs in waves!
> The deep distressful silence of the scene
> Breaks up with mingling of unnumbered sounds
> And universal motion. He is come,
> Shaking a shower of blossoms from the shrubs,
> And bearing on their fragrance; and he brings
> Music of birds, and rustling of young boughs,

And sound of swaying branches, and the voice
Of distant waterfalls. All the green herbs
Are stirring in his breath; a thousand flowers,
By the road-side, and the borders of the brook,
Nod gaily to each other; glossy leaves
Are twinkling in the sun, as if the dew
Were on them yet, and silver waters break
Into small waves, and sparkle as he comes.'—*Bryant*, p. 93.

Imagination may, perhaps, have more to do than simple description with the following powerful impression of darkness. But we feel that a real scene, though now invisible, is vividly present to his memory. The poem from which it is taken was written in Italy.

'A midnight black with clouds is in the sky;
I seem to feel upon my limbs the weight
Of its vast brooding shadow. All in vain
Turns the tired eye in search of form; no star
Pierces the pitchy veil; no ruddy blaze,
From dwellings lighted by the cheerful hearth,
Tinges the flowering summits of the grass.
No sound of life is heard, no village hum,
Nor measured tramp of footstep in the path,
Nor rush of wing, while, on the breast of Earth,
I lie and listen to her mighty voice:
A voice of many tones—sent up from streams
That wander through the gloom, from woods unseen,
Swayed by the sweeping of the tides of air,
From rocky chasms where darkness dwells all day,
And hollows of the great invisible hills,
And sands that edge the ocean, stretching far
Into the night—a melancholy sound.'—P. 272.

Willis has these pleasant lines on the 'Dawn,' though he is less nature's poet than his countryman, and seldom forgets *himself.*

'Throw up the window! 'Tis a morn for life
In its most subtle luxury. The air
Is like a breathing from a rarer world;
And the south wind is like a gentle friend,
Parting the hair so softly on my brow.
It has come over gardens, and the flowers
That kiss'd it are betrayed; for as it parts,
With its invisible fingers, my light hair,
I know it has been trifling with the rose,
And stooping to the violet. There is joy
For all God's creatures in it. The wet leaves
Are stirring at its touch, and birds are singing,
As if to breathe were music, and the grass
Sends up its modest odour with the dew,
Like the small tribute of humility.'—*Willis*, p. 242.

There is something grave and sweet in the undisturbed serenity of a lonely Indian lake, as described by Whittier; melancholy and desolate even in opening spring.

'Around Sebago's lonely lake
There lingers not a breeze to break
The mirror which its waters make.

The solemn pines along its shore,
The firs which hang its grey rocks o'er,
Are painted on its glassy floor.

The sun looks o'er, with hazy eye,
The snowy mountain-tops which lie
Piled coldly up against the sky.

Dazzling and white! save where the bleak
Wild winds have bared some splintering peak,
Or snow-slide left its dusky streak.

Yet green are Saco's banks below,
And belts of spruce and cedar show,
Dark fringing round those cones of snow.

The earth hath felt the breath of Spring,
Though yet upon her tardy wing
The lingering frosts of Winter cling.

Fresh grasses fringe the meadow-brooks,
And mildly from its sunny nooks
The blue eye of the violet looks.

And odours from the springing grass,
The sweet birch and the sassafras,
Upon the scarce felt breezes pass.

Her tokens of renewing care
Hath Nature scattered everywhere,
On bud and flower, and warmer air.'

Longfellow gives us a cheerfuller impression of the same season, advanced into May.

'The sun is bright, the air is clear,
The darting swallows soar and sing,
And from the stately elms I hear
The blue-bird prophesying Spring.

So blue yon winding river flows,
It seems an outlet from the sky,
Where, waiting till the west wind blows,
The freighted clouds at anchor lie.

All things are new—the buds, the leaves,
That gild the elm-tree's nodding crest,
And even the nest beneath the eaves—
There are no birds in last year's nest.'

Another spring scene, by Albert Street, from his 'Forest Walk,' given with characteristic care and fidelity.

'Sweet forest odours have their birth
From the clothed boughs and teeming earth;
Where pine cones dropp'd, leaves piled and dead,
Long tufts of grass and stars of fern,
With many a wild flower's fairy urn,
A thick, elastic carpet spread;
Here with its mossy pall, the trunk,
Resolving into soil, is sunk;
There wrench'd but lately from its throne,
By some fierce whirlwind circling past,
Its huge roots mass'd with earth and stone,
One of the woodland kings is cast.
Above, the forest tops are bright
With the broad blaze of sunny light;
But now a fitful air-gust parts
The screening branches, and a glow
Of dazzling, startling radiance darts
Down the dark stem, and breaks below;
The mingled shadows off are roll'd,
The sylvan floor is bathed in gold:
Low sprouts and herbs, before unseen,
Display their shades of brown and green;
Tints brighten o'er the velvet moss,
Gleams twinkle on the laurel's gloss;

The robin brooding in her nest,
Chirps as the quick ray strikes her breast;
And as my shadow prints the ground,
I see the rabbit upward bound,
With pointed ears, an instant look,
Then scamper to the darkest nook,
Where, with crouch'd limb and staring eye,
He watches while I saunter by.'

Poets of America, p. 398.

Forest scenery,—its vistas,—its crowding giant stems,—its lights and shadows,—its moss, its streams, its flowers,—afford a happy and an inexhaustible theme.

This is a brooklet in the woods, by W. G. Sims.

'A little farther on, there is a brook
Where the breeze lingers idly. The high trees
Have roof'd it with their crowding limbs and leaves,
So that the sun drinks not from its sweet fount,
And the shade cools it. You may hear it now,
A low, faint beating, as upon the leaves
That lie beneath its rapids, it descends
In a fine, showery rain, that keeps one tune,
And 'tis a sweet one, still of constancy.'—P. 305.

Of all seasons, autumn, after the wont of poets, is most fondly expatiated upon; and a character of cheerfulness is thrown over its fading glories, which gives a new tone to our feelings. Halleck, in his 'Connecticut,' thus gives the palm to the American autumn, while allowing the claim of European summers; and dwells on its influence.

'In the autumn time
Earth has no purer and no lovelier clime.

Her clear, warm heaven at noon,—the mist that shrouds
Her twilight hills,—her cool and starry eves,
The glorious splendour of her sunset clouds,
The rainbow beauty of her forest leaves,
Come o'er the eye in solitude and crowds,
Whene'er his web of song her poet weaves;
And his mind's brightest vision but displays
The autumn scenery of his boyhood's days.—P. 175.

And after some brilliant and vivid descriptions in his 'Autumn Woods,' Bryant exclaims:—

'Oh, Autumn! why so soon
Depart the hues that make thy forests glad,
Thy gentle wind, and thy fair sunny noon,
And leave thee wild and sad!

Ah! 'twere a lot too bless'd
For ever in thy coloured shades to stray;
Amid the kisses of the soft south-west
To rove and dream for aye;

And leave the vain, low strife,
That makes men mad—the tug for wealth and power,
The passions and the cares that wither life,
And waste its little hour.'—P. 112.

Emerson *in description* can be rational and intelligible—a most rare state of mind with him. His snow storm is finely given:—

'Announced by all the trumpets of the sky
Arrives the snow, and, driving o'er the fields,
Seems nowhere to alight: the whited air
Hides hills and woods, the river and the heaven,
And veils the farm-house at the garden's end.
The steed and traveller stopped, the courier's feet
Delayed, all friends shut out, the housemates sit
Around the radiant fire-place, enclosed
In a tumultuous privacy of storm.
Come, see the north wind's masonry,
Out of an unseen quarry evermore
Furnished with tile, the fierce artificer
Curves his white bastions with projected roof
Round every windward stake, or tree, or door.
Speeding, the myriad-handed, his wild work
So fanciful, so savage, nought cares he
For number or proportion. Mockingly
On coop or kennel he hangs Parian wreaths;
A swan-like form invests the hidden thorn;
Fills up the farmer's lane from wall to wall,
Maugre the farmer's sighs, and at the gate
A tapering turret overtops the work.
And when his hours are numbered, and the world
Is all his own, retiring, as he were not,
Leaves, when the sun appears, astonished Art
To mimic in slow structures, stone by stone
Built in an age, the mad wind's night-work,
The frolic architecture of the snow.'—*Emerson*, p. 49.

To conclude this list of examples, which we leave most imperfect, in the fear of running to too great length, we will give the same writer's pretty description of a poet of nature—'a minstrel of the natural year'—and thus a fair representative of his country's rural muse:—

'And such I knew, a forest seer,
A minstrel of the natural year,
Foreteller of the vernal ides,
Wise harbinger of spheres and tides,
A lover true who knew by heart
Each joy the mountain dales impart;
It seemed that nature could not raise
A plant in any secret place,
In quaking bog, or snowy hill,
Beneath the grass that shades the rill,
Under the snow, between the rocks,
In damp fields known to bird and fox,
But he would come the very hour
It opened in its virgin bower,
As if a sunbeam showed the place,
And tell its long-descended race.
It seemed as if the breezes brought him,
It seemed as if the sparrows taught him,
As if by secret sight he knew
Where in far fields the orchis grew.
There are many events in the field,
Which are not shown to common eyes,
But all her shows did nature yield
To please and win this pilgrim wise.
He saw the partridge drum in the woods,
He heard the woodcock's evening hymn,
He found the tawny thrush's broods;
And the sky-hawk did wait for him.
What others did at distance hear,
And guessed within the thicket's gloom,
Was showed to this philosopher,
And at his bidding seemed to come.'
Emerson, p. 53.

But this power which we have dwelt upon, of portraying nature; even when genuine, often becomes tedious and prolix in the hands of the unimaginative. It is not enough that a scene should be accurately drawn—we look for masterly strokes and clear lights and shades. The artist's eye should embrace the whole picture at once, we are then safe from wearisome minuteness. For neither in the scene itself, nor in the successful delineation of it, can we see every object with equal distinctness. If the distance is full and clear, the foreground is only visible in its broadest details; if near objects are vividly given, then remote ones are but dimly and unconsciously seen. Wilcox is thought by his countrymen to be very happy in his scenes—but we feel them liable to this objection, though given with a conscientiousness which proves his own delight in nature. But a defect which obscures the merit of descriptions of nature, where we have time and patience to wait upon the author's leisure, becomes absolutely fatal to success in delineations connected with action and passion. With some writers we positively cannot get on in the most stirring scenes—the most awe-inspiring circumstances—the most breathless turning points of interest—for endless, never wearying description. No occasion is too sacred—no personal concern of the writer too absorbing, to divert him from his fate of describing every actor in the scene, as well as the localities itself, with a fulness of detail and a minuteness of observation, which few persons in real life think it worth while to bestow on their most intimate acquaintance. In modern literature generally, it is matter of surprise how many points of demeanour, how many insignificant accidents of feature, are dwelt upon, in the most unimportant character the author brings before us. Persons in actual life come and go, and we often retain but a dim impression of their most important characteristics; but in modern fiction, each individual that appears upon the scene must have not only his leading peculiarities described, but even the turn of his chin—the curve of his nostril—the size of his hands and feet—the amount of wave in his hair,—are not left to our fancy—points in which many a man would pass but a poor examination, if suddenly called on to draw his best friend's picture in words. But what we hold to be unworthy an able writer in prose, *desecrates* poetry; that art which, in a master's hand, can with a few glowing words raise an image more real and definite than pages of mere measurement and proportion. This condensation, however, these sudden flashes of intelligence between author and reader, by apparently inadequate means, are not at all the American poet's style for producing effect. He takes his time, and expects his readers to be patient.

Mr. Willis's handsomely printed and decorated volume opens with a series of Scripture sketches, which made his early fame. The subjects he chooses involve occasions for the delineation of sublime zeal, heroism, and devotion—they ought not to have been attempted with any other view; but in this writer's hands they are, one and all, only shallow excuses for an elaborate portrait of each character in the scene. When this is done, he has seldom anything more to say; but his task has already occupied so much space and time, that he may well be blind to the real fact, that as yet he has not begun his subject. Facility at description indeed—the kind of feeling of having *something* to say, is very apt to delude its possessor into ignorance that, after all, he has not the *right* thing to say. One notable instance of this delusion may be seen in his 'Rizpah.'

Warmly impressed by the words of Scripture, he believes himself to see beyond that simple narrative into her very heart. The impression is not as yet certainly very distinct, but words will help him on; his present glow will develope into inspiration by the time he wants it. *One* thing he can do—her two sons were probably beautiful, and his forte lies in describing beauty; the beginning is safe and easy. We extract his picture of the younger son, as a good example of this author's style:—

> 'As he spoke, a step,
> Light as an antelope's, the threshold press'd,
> And, like a beam of light, into the room
> Enter'd Mephibosheth. What bird of heaven
> Or creature of the wild—what flower of earth—
> Was like this fairest of the sons of Saul!
> The violet's cup was harsh to his blue eye.
> Less agile was the fierce barb's fiery step.
> His voice drew hearts to him. His smile was like
> The incarnation of some blessed dream—
> Its joyousness so sunn'd the gazer's eye!
> Fair were his locks. His snowy teeth divided
> A bow of Love drawn with a scarlet thread.
> His cheek was like the moist heart of the rose;
> And, but for nostrils of that breathing fire
> That turns the lion back, and limbs as lithe
> As in the velvet muscle of the pard,
> Mephibosheth had been too fair for man.
> As if he were a vision that would fade,
> Rizpah gazed on him. Never, to her eye,
> Grew his bright form familiar; but, like stars,
> That seem'd each night new lit in a new heaven,
> He was each morn's sweet gift to her. She loved
> Her firstborn, as a mother loves her child,
> Tenderly, fondly. But for him—the last—
> What had she done for heaven to be his mother!'
>
> *Willis*, p. 71.

Then follows a digression on mother's love; after which

Mephibosheth presents his mother with a cake of meal, for which he had sold his Lybian barb, and bids her

> 'Fear not, my mother,
> Thy sons will be Elijah's ravens to thee.'

With which anachronism the poem comes to an abrupt conclusion; the words 'unfinished' in Roman capitals, leaving us to understand that our poet broke down. He had, in fact, started on a most ambitious subject, a mother's intense, unfathomable love for her children, and the other untold motives for her self-devotion, with literally no other materials for his work than an idea of the sons' personal beauty. All can admire Rizpah's constancy, but to realize it does need a poet's imagination. In those long weeks of watching by day and by night, surrounded by her mouldering dead, slain by God's righteous judgment, what thoughts must have been hers—what bitter memories—what weariness — what fortitude — what resignation — what natural fears and shudderings—what anguish—what terrible imaginations! What a void must life, once so proud and prosperous, have then presented to her! how awful must she have been to those who beheld her watching—the wild beasts fleeing before her, scared by the majesty of her desperation rather than by that flaming torch she waves against them! We do not wonder that Mr. Willis gave up the hope to portray all, and far more than this; but we do wonder that he should raise the expectation of his readers, who look for nothing short of it, only to tell them of the beauty of her sons. Rizpah needed no graces of person in her children, to sacrifice more than life for their sake, and for the memory of their kingly father.

In 'Jairus's daughter,' our author descends to still greater minuteness of detail; not only what we are supposed to *see* is given—'the blood still rosy in the tapering nails'—'the line 'of pearl through her parted lips'—'the nostrils spiritually 'thin'—but even the '*small round ears*' hid by her unbound hair;—the effect of the whole in the desire to produce a pretty effect, being so much more sleep than death, that the wonder of the miracle is lost. So grand an occasion for expatiating on female beauty as Jephtha's daughter presents, of course is not lost; but here again the effect is spoiled of a really graceful picture, by an allusion, of all people, to Praxiteles; 'a shape 'Praxiteles might worship.' He has indeed throughout no idea of the spiritual and ideal in beauty, it is all form; and thus is not only without moral, but without that effect it is alone worthy the efforts of poetry to produce. These points, however, degenerate into mere matters of taste, compared to others where this writer does not scruple to step in with his descriptive pen.

In the miracles, which are the frequent subject of his choice for these sketches, our Lord himself as the Divine actor in the scene is of necessity introduced. There is no point in which a commonly reverent mind is more sensitive, than any departure from the Christian *type* of that sacred Form. We feel that words must but faintly approach so awful a subject; painting has the prescriptive right alone (we almost unwillingly admit a like privilege to the sister art) to portray it to us. The rudest performance that faithfully gives that type we can tolerate, but we shrink from any new idea—any attempt at originality, even in the noblest genius. He must fill us with awe and love, but leave, so to say, no trace of himself in his work; we must recognise our own impressions, or we start back alarmed and repelled. Every other figure on the canvas is the painter's own, but in that One he must strive only to give back each man's idea—sublimated and refined by highest art. Art can achieve this, while words never attempt more than reverently to touch upon this theme without wounding. But the passion for description will not bend before such instincts; and Mr. Willis on several occasions ventures on this forbidden ground; with no intentional irreverence, but with a presumption and insensibility which we will not give our readers the pain of proving by quotation—(see pages 15, 18, 24, 56, &c., in the large edition of his works). As an example, however, of the heedlessness with which such a subject is approached, we will give one line:—

> ‘And as Jesus' voice
> With its *bewildering* sweetness—’

What an epithet for that Voice—the true Guide—which His sheep shall hear! the Voice which shall direct them in the right way to the one fold!

The contrast the reader is led to make between past and present authors, is somewhat striking in this matter of description. It may be that in looking back the mind recurs to *models* only, and in reviewing the present to the general tone of literature; for that there are examples of the other method in old writers, which show little enough skill in the management of detail, we are ready to admit. But in referring, for example, to those characters of Shakspeare which leave on our minds the greatest impression of beauty, we find it conveyed we scarcely know how:—‘O you wonder!’ and again, ‘But you, O you, ‘so perfect and so peerless,’ paint to us Miranda; and we believe the feeling of Desdemona's extreme loveliness is left upon us only by one attribute of beauty, her fairness:

> ‘That whiter skin of hers than snow,
> And smooth as monumental alabaster.’

Constance, the bereaved mother, indulges in no recapitulation of her Arthur's boyish graces,—'my pretty Arthur,' 'his 'pretty looks,'—she only says:—and again

'For since the birth of Cain, the first man child,
To him who did but yesterday suspire,
There was not such a gracious creature born.'

It is thus she dwells upon the beauty of her son. Cleopatra, that enchantress, is 'the serpent of old Nile'—'the day o' the 'world:' and when Juliet appears at her window, 'It is the 'east, and Juliet is the sun.' Even Spenser, in whom we should confidently look for exceptions to our general view, usually contents himself with expatiating on the pure snowy whiteness—white beyond all the comparisons he assembles together,—'but she whiter far,' of the fair allegorical imaginations he sets before us; a touch of rose, and golden hair, commonly completes the picture—which yet has something more of distinctness and individuality than might be expected from the sameness of the means employed.

Dryden's and Chaucer's Emilia, in 'May Morning,' stands prettily before us:—

'Fresh as the month and as the morning fair,
Adown her shoulders fell her length of hair.'

And though possibly somewhat stiff, do we desire a fuller picture of our common mother, than that so familiar to us?

'Grace was in all her steps, heaven in her eye,
In every gesture dignity and love.'

As she advances,

'Blushing like the morn,'

what minuteness can add to our conviction of Beatrice's absolute beauty, 'la donna beata e bella,' her eyes shining like the star, and her angelic voice? Petrarch has more leisure, and less lofty views than his countryman; but where he so beautifully recalls Laura's image, and raises one of the fairest and sweetest pictures poet ever imagined whereby to enhance the sadness of decay and death, with how few touches it is given!

'Le crespe chiome d'or puro lucente
E 'l lampeggiar del' angelico riso,
Che solean far in terra un paradiso,
Poca polvere son che nulla sente.'

It is commonly by the vivid impression given of the effect of beauty on those who behold it, that poetry conveys the idea of that beauty to ourselves. It is done, as it were, by reflection. We think Desdemona beautiful because Othello so keenly feels her to be so. Ferdinand is lost in rapturous wonder in beholding Miranda, and therefore we are willing to believe her, with him, to be

> 'The goddess on whom those airs attend.'

The highest beauty can no more be described by separating it into its component parts, than a chemist can convey an idea of a rose by telling us what it is made of; and there is a freedom and want of reverence which offends us in the attempt elaborately to define what it is that produces such wonderful effects.[1]

But to return from our digression. Hillhouse, in his 'Day of Judgment,' is another remarkable example of the force of this tendency to minute description which we have dwelt upon. Of this poem, Mr. Griswold, in the notice he appends to each author in his national collection, says, while admitting the difficulties the subject involves,—

> 'Other poets had essayed their powers in describing the events of the last day. The public voice, however, has decided that among all the poems on this great subject, that of Mr. Hillhouse stands unequalled. His object was "to present such a view of the last grand spectacle as seemed the most susceptible of poetical embellishment," and rarely have we seen grandeur of conception and simplicity of design as admirably united. His representation of the scene is vivid and energetic; while the manner in which he has grouped and contrasted the countless array of characters of every age displays the highest degree of artistic skill. Each character he summons up appears before us with historic costume and features faithfully preserved; and we seem to gaze upon him as a reality, and not merely as the bold imagery of the poet. His description of the last setting of the sun in the west, and the dreamer's farewell to the evening star, as it was fading for ever from his sight, are passages of beauty, which it would be difficult to find surpassed.'

The subject is indeed unspeakably 'difficult,' and needing the utmost intensity of the poet's imagination. For one moment the human mind may conceive something of its terrors. Are there words burning, breathing, awful enough to communicate this momentary vision to man? One hindrance there is to such a possibility. Who can master the thought, even for an instant, but as *himself* standing before the throne? There may be a sense of rushing, innumerable multitudes, waves beyond waves illimitable, but before he can distinguish amidst those pale, countless, crowding forms, the vision has passed away. The 'Dies iræ' is, perhaps, the most powerful human effort to impress the terrors of that day on the heart of man, for there each soul is made to feel itself, guilty, helpless, alone—'Quod sum miser tunc dicturus,' each says, striking his breast, as his heart sinks under the unimaginable awfulness of that hour.

---

[1] It is remarkable, in this point of view, to observe Dante's notice of Beatrice, in his Life, when he was not under the stern laws which guided and chastened his Divine Poem. The following is his account of the occasion of her first addressing him. 'It chanced that on the last of these days this most admirable person appeared to me in a dress of the purest white, between two noble ladies, and passing along the street she turned her eyes towards the spot where I stood, and with an ineffable courtesy (which now has its reward in eternity) saluted me in so striking a manner that I seemed to reach the very extreme of happiness. The hour at which I received this most bewitching salutation was precisely the None of that day; and as this was the first time her words had reached my ears, the pleasure that I received was such that I quitted the company, as it were, in a state of intoxication.' Here the accuracy with which he notes the *time* of her apppearance, as if of some divine apparition, his intense happiness at so small a favour as her salutation, all give the impression of something almost superhumanly gracious and beautiful, which we would not exchange for the loveliest picture words could draw.

But even in the faintest and remotest degree to realise 'The Judgment' by deliberate survey and calm contemplation of its details, we hold to be impossible. One look, even, dazzles and overwhelms. And the reader must sympathize in the poet's terrors to be brought to feel them in his own person. If the writer be at ease, so will his reader be; and we own ourselves very little moved or excited by Mr. Hillhouse's 'last grand spectacle,' as he calls it. Mr. Hillhouse was (he died in 1841) a Churchman and the friend of Churchmen, and had thus a vast advantage over the majority of his countrymen, and one of which we see the good fruits. We feel throughout, as it were, in safe hands; there is nothing irreverent, nothing to pain or offend. But he hopes to do all by infinite minuteness. He describes the scene, the angels, the Judge, the throne; he describes the archangels that guard it, with considerable force and power; he describes the crowd of souls, and detracts from the awful impetuosity of their forced advance by details of

'Tiars, and helms, and sparkling diadems.'

'For all appeared
As in their days of earthly pride; the clank
Of steel announced the warrior, and the robe
Of Tyrian lustre spoke the blood of kings.'

And from this multitude he next proceeds to select individuals for a fuller and minuter portraiture. Among these our common parent must almost necessarily find the first place. We give the following description as among the best of the pictures.

'Nearest the mount, of that mix'd phalanx first,
Our general parent stood: not as he look'd
Wandering at eve, amid the shady bowers
And odorous groves of that delicious garden,
Or flowery banks of some soft rolling stream,
Pausing to list its welling murmur, hand

> In hand with peerless Eve, the rose too sweet,
> Fatal to paradise. Fled from his cheek
> The bloom of Eden: his hyacinthine locks
> Were changed to gray; with years, with sorrows bow'd
> He seem'd; but through his ruin'd form still shone
> The majesty of his Creator: round
> Upon his sons a grieved and pitying look
> He cast, and in his vesture hid his face.'

We cannot, however, enter into Mr. Griswold's commendation of the author's happy arrangement and grouping of his figures. We own we were taken by surprise when Julius Cæsar followed close upon Adam. We will give them in the order in which they come, omitting of necessity the twelve or twenty lines of description devoted to each. Near Julius Cæsar, 'Abraham rested on his staff,' and by his side, Joseph 'proudly decked in tissued purple, sweeping to the ground.' Then

> 'At hand a group of sages *mark'd the scene;*
> Plato and Socrates together stood.'

Nearer the mount stood Moses; beyond him 'the twelve apostles stand;' then Alexander the Great.—'Turn now where stood the spotless Virgin sweet;'—and immediately after, amid a crowd of monarchs, Nebuchadnezzar. The order of the three last in succession, perhaps, does more than shock our taste. It is, however, easier to smile at any possible arrangement than to suggest a better. The group of sages *marking* the scene so collectedly, conveys to us very much the tranquil state of mind our author manifests throughout. Instead of that overpowering rush of events which our imagination suggests, there seems to be abundant time for all his observations. On one occasion, indeed, time absolutely lingers in its flight—

> 'And weary with conjecture, round I gazed.'

Yet while we think the author fails in what should be the great aim in venturing on so ambitious a subject, there is yet much grace and tenderness in his poem, beauties which would have affected and impressed the reader more in a fitter scene for their display. The following is the address to the evening star, commended by Mr. Griswold.

> 'Mild twinkling, through a silver-skirted cloud,
> The solitary star of evening shone.
> While gazing wistful on that peerless light,
> Hereafter to be seen no more (as oft
> In dreams strange images will mix,) sad thoughts
> Pass'd o'er my soul. Sorrowing, I cried, "Farewell,
> Pale beauteous planet, that displayest so soft
> Amid yon glowing streak thy transient beam,
> A long, a last farewell! Seasons have changed,
> Ages and empires roll'd like smoke away,

But thou unaltered, beam'st as silver fair
As on thy birthnight! Bright and watchful eyes,
From palaces and bowers, have hail'd thy gem
With secret transport! natal star of love,
And souls that love the shadowy hour of fancy.
How much I owe thee, how I bless thy ray!
How oft thy rising o'er the hamlet green,
Signal of rest, and social converse sweet;
Beneath some patriarchal tree, has cheer'd
The peasant's heart and drawn his benison!
Pride of the west! beneath thy placid light
The tender tale shall never more be told,
Man's soul shall never wake to joy again:
Thou sett'st for ever. Lovely orb, farewell."'

Hillhouse, both as a poet and dramatist, ranks high with his countrymen. Mr. Willis, in the best of his poems, 'The Elms of Newhaven,' feelingly deplores the poet's loss; and Mr. Kipp, who furnishes some details of his character and death, touches upon these with an affectionate tenderness which must excite our respect for him as a man: while it is added that, on his visit to our country, Mr. Zachary Macaulay pronounced him the most accomplished young gentleman he ever met.

Poets are proverbially precocious; our own annals tell of early genius, of Milton, Cowley, Pope, and Chatterton. But America, which so rapidly develops her children's bodily frames, also goes far 'a-head' of our old world training, in bringing out their minds. Like a fond mother, she encourages all youthful efforts, makes much of them, treasures them up, preserves them—not like our fond mothers, secretly, and half ashamed, in some guarded repository, but in all the publicity, in all the dignity, in all the delightful perpetuity (as it seems to the juvenile mind) of print. Half the poets in Mr. Griswold's collection had come out as authors before they were eighteen, either in reviews, or as habitual contributors to the newspaper's poetical corner, or in all the state of a volume of their own. Bryant wrote a satirical poem in his thirteenth year which excited deserved attention, and came to a second edition.[1]

---

[1] None of his earliest poems are republished in the new and complete edition of his works; but the following lines are given as being surprising in themselves for that early age, and also curious from the contrast of their somewhat turgid and lofty epithets with the modesty and chastened simplicity of his riper mind.

'E'er while I sing, see Faction urge her claim,
Mislead with falsehood, and with zeal inflame;
Lift her black banner, spread her empire wide,
And stalk triumphant with a Fury's stride.
She blows her brazen trump, and, at the sound,
A motley throng obedient flock around;
A mist of changing hue o'er all she flings,
And darkness perches on her dragon wings!

'O, might

Hillhouse 'had long been distinguished for the elegance and good taste of his compositions' when he was selected by the Phi Beta Kappa Society to deliver a poem before them. He chose the subject of 'The Judgment,' and at the age of two and twenty pronounced the poem we have commented on, before that Society. Longfellow and Willis 'were known as poets' at seventeen. Whittier undertook the editorship of a Boston paper at twenty, having previously won a reputation by writings both in verse and prose. Epes Sargent composed a descriptive poem at twelve. Drake was a contributor to several gazettes at fifteen. Albert Street's earliest printed composition appeared at fourteen, and Albert Greene's at sixteen. We might continue our list to twice its length, but our enumeration of authors may already have gone beyond the knowledge of our readers. This early intimacy with newspapers, magazines, and reviews, often continues through a whole literary life. Indeed the management of periodicals appears the only means for obtaining anything like decent or suitable remuneration to those who devote themselves to literature. We cannot but think this early introduction to the public to be very injurious (except in cases where there is strength and stamina to resist every debilitating influence) to the free growth and development of the mind. A boy's poem is only an exercise until it is printed; after this magical process it is a work, a performance. It becomes a part of the writer; he has committed himself, he has begun the business of life. If he pleases, by writing prettily, he is not likely to practise the patience and philosophy necessary to attain higher and sounder commendation. He feels himself already a man; he has taken a line—he has his style—his readers—his admirers, be their judgment worth what it may; and his mind is set and fixed, as it were, in a mould, before the youthful aspirants of another system have opened, free and unfettered upon their career.

This premature newspaper authorship may account for one feature we observe in the class of American writers who aim directly at popularity—a certain taste for the exciting and horrible, and a relaxation of those laws which, by universal con-

---

'O, might some patriot rise! the gloom dispel,
Chase Error's mist, and break her magic spell!
But vain the wish, for hark! the murmuring meed
Of hoarse applause from yonder shed proceed;
Enter, and view the thronging concourse there,
Intent, with gaping mouth and stupid stare:
While in the midst their supple leader stands,
Harangues aloud and flourishes his hands;
To adulation tunes his servile throat,
And sues successful for each blockhead's vote.'

sent, have hitherto restrained all who call themselves poets, from the direct expression of whatever is repulsive or revolting. Whatever may be remotely inferred, details of butchery and carnage—a too rude attack on the sanctity of the human frame—forms of suffering and death shocking to the nerves of the fancy, and even certain conditions of merely mental pain and calamity, have been felt beneath the dignity and opposed to the humanizing and softening influence of verse. Poetry should have only a grand and typical truth in its treatment of all those physical sorrows to which our flesh is heir. It may tell us of death and decay, but may not enter into the details of corruption; it may speak of bleeding wounds, but not paint with a surgeon's accuracy all the frightful circumstances that attend upon them. The noble mind may be portrayed unhinged,

'The sweet bells jangling, out of tune, and harsh,'

without our being shocked by the maniac's jibbering, and his frantic cries. Poetry should give us the idea,—whatever there is to excite worthy emotions in all these things,—with the fidelity of sculpture, rather than in mere waxwork imitation. We recognise in some writers a decided taste for the Chamber of Horrors. To begin with an example in a lighter vein, Oliver W. Holmes we are assured has won for himself an enduring reputation as a poet. 'He possesses a rich vein of humour, with learning and originality, and great skill as an artist.' Thus gifted, he writes a playful piece, called 'The Dilemma,' on the conflicting merits of black eyes and blue, a subject on which poets of different nations have already said so many graceful and pretty things. It is probably to assert his originality that Mr. Holmes thus treats this gay theme in the second stanza:

'I had a vision in my dreams;
I saw a row of twenty beams;
From every beam a rope was hung,
In every rope a lover swung.
I ask'd the hue of every eye
That bade each luckless lover die;
Ten *livid* lips said, heavenly blue,
And ten accused the darker hue.'

Mr. Percival is thus ferocious in his patriotism:

'Hail to the morn, when first they stood
    On Bunker's height,
And fearless stemm'd the invading flood,
And wrote our dearest rights in blood,
And mow'd in ranks the hireling brood,
    In desperate fight!
Oh! 'twas a proud exulting day;
For even our fallen fortunes lay
    In light.'

Mr. Bright, in a poem called 'The Vision of Death,' where he imagines himself joining a vast procession of the dead, among much that is equally revolting, contains the following disgusting conception:—

'Once, once I stopp'd, where something gleam'd
With a bright and star-like ray;
And I stooped to take the diamond up
From the grass on which it lay;
'Twas an eye that from its socket fell,
As some wretch toil'd on his way.'

Whittier's whole poem of 'Mogg Megone' is an example of the style we deprecate. 'In portraying the Indian character,' we are told, he 'followed as closely as practicable the rough but 'natural delineations of Church, Mather, and other authors, and 'therefore discarded much of the romance which more modern 'writers have thrown around the red man's life.' The tale altogether seems written with the malicious design of destroying illusions; for the early colonists are not made much more attractive than their savage opponents. Ruth, the heroine, and daughter of an English outlaw, falls so readily into the manners of her father's adopted countrymen, as not to rest satisfied till she holds in her hand the brown-haired scalp of her treacherous lover. There is little relief from blood and ferocity throughout. On whatever page the eye rests it encounters something savage and inhuman; and yet on a gentler theme Mr. Whittier can write well.

How savage life, served *au naturel*, suits the taste of the civilized reader, may be judged by the following passage, extracted almost at random. The interlocutors are Bomazeen an Indian, and a French Jesuit, in league with him and his tribe.

'Black with the grime of paint and dust,
Spotted and streaked with human gore,
A grim and naked head is thrust
Within the chapel-door.
"Ha!—BOMAZEEN!—In God's name say
What mean these sounds of bloody fray?"
Silent the Indian points his hand
To where across the echoing glen
Sweep Harmon's dreaded ranger band,
And Moulton with his men.
"Where are thy warriors, Bomazeen?
Where are De Rouville and Castine?
And where the braves of Sawga's queen?"
Let my father find the winter's sun
Which the sun drank up long moons ago!
Under the falls of Tacconock
The wolves are eating the Norridgewock;
Castine, with his wives, lies closely hid

Like a fox in the woods of Pemaquid!
On Sawga's banks the man of war
Sits in his wigwam like a squaw—
Squando has fled, and Mogg Megone,
Stuck by the knife of Sagamore John,
Lies stiff and stark, and cold as a stone.'

The heart of the Jesuit fails him, and he falls on his knees before the altar.

'No shrift the gloomy savage brooks
As scowling on the priest he looks;
"Cowesass—cowesass—tawhich wessaseen?[1]
Let my father look upon Bomazeen.
My father's heart is the heart of a squaw,
But mine is so hard that it does not thaw.
Let my father ask his God to make
A dance and a feast for a great Sagamore,
When he journies across the western lake
With his dogs and his squaws to the spirit's shore.
Cowesass—cowesass—tawhich wessaseen?
Let my father die like Bomazeen." '

Even Mr. Bryant more than once brings painful and revolting images before the mind, which jar unpleasantly upon us in the pure flow of his verse. In his pathetic ballad, 'The Murdered Traveller,' we would rather not have had the following idea suggested in such straightforward words:

'They little knew, who loved him so,
The fearful death he met,
When shouting o'er the desert snow,
Unarm'd and hard beset.

'Nor how when round the frosty pole
The northern dawn is red,
The mountain wolf and wild cat stole
To banquet on the dead.'

Again, in that wild and pretty fancy of 'The Strange Lady,' who lures the young hunter to his fate, we would have dispensed with these details:—

'Next day, within a mossy glen, mid mouldering trunks were found
The fragments of a human form upon the bloody ground;
White bones from which the flesh was torn, and locks of glossy hair;
They laid him in the place of graves, yet wist not whose they were.'

Willis has a poem open far more seriously to the same objection, the story of Parrhesius, who, while painting his Prometheus, bought a captive—an old man—in the slave market, with the deliberate intention of putting him to torture and death: which purpose he puts into execution under Mr. Willis's careful and elaborate description. We will spare our readers a long scene given in all its horrible details, which would too well illustrate our meaning, and which the artist further realizes to us by an engraving of the unhappy victim on the rack.

---

[1] Are you afraid? why fear you?

There is a certain class of songs now popular in our own country, whose aim is to excite and harrow the feelings, by somewhat vulgar means. The titles of some of these, as 'The 'Gambler's Wife,' 'The Maniac,' &c., may be known to our readers; these also are of American origin.

In one region of the fancy—that of fertility in simile and illustration, we have already said that few American poets show much invention, of a kind at least that good taste can commend. Longfellow is the one obvious exception, whose genius takes a different direction from that of his countrymen. Theirs lies, as we have said, in the delineation of material nature, which may account for a less luxuriant play of fancy. It is while viewing the stir of passion, the trials and reverses of life, the varying affections and conflicting emotions of the heart, that we turn from what so perplexes us to seek for some parallel in nature, who in all her moods has balm and consolation for the vexed and wearied spirit. It is a relief to find sympathy there for all the contradictions and sorrows of poor humanity; and thus the poet, as spokesman for his brethren, cannot delineate the turmoils of life without for ever turning to refresh his spirit, either by finding a contrast in nature's repose, or an analogy in those stirs and convulsions of which the outer, inanimate world has also its share and portion. When nations fall we are led by Divine guidance to think of the moon and the stars darkened; when good men die it is the sun sinking to his glorious rest; when rebellion overturns kingdoms and polities, we recal the convulsions of earthquakes and the ravages of volcanoes. We fade as a leaf; we wither like grass; our opening life is as the morning light, it sets too often in clouds and rain. The fair maiden is the lily flower; the honest, true-hearted man the forest oak. Time is a river, eternity the ocean, —and so through the innumerable analogies which are, as it were, part of ourselves; so that there is no position or circumstance of life but a thousand apt similitudes may be found for it, either familiar to all, or which the occasion leads each one to discover for himself.

But the poet of nature, in his quiet contemplation, is in the very region of rest and repose; he finds his home where the other is but a brief and hurried sojourner, seeking momentary relaxation from the stern business of life. He is no actor in the scene of his meditation, his passions are never excited. Through the wildest elemental strife he gazes on, never so much disturbed but he can calmly moralize and muse over the lesson all nature teaches. When he looks back into busy life, it is only to congratulate himself on his escape from it; he is not tempted to any elaborate review or comparison. Still he feels the analogy to exist as impressively between nature and human life, as in that other aspect of it, life comparing itself with nature; only in his case it prompts him to trace out a moral—in the other, to detect a similitude. A storm raises no turmoil in his breast, therefore it does not pleasure him to compare it to the wrath of men; but the poet of action can hardly dwell upon some human ebullition of fury, without recurring to parallel hurricanes and tornadoes in the natural world: as, in common parlance, we say a storming passion, but never a passionate storm. Thus we believe exuberance of fancy, simile, and illustration, belong to the poet of life and action, as the great scene for the display of all these graces lies in the Epic.

Bryant has scarcely one elaborate simile in his collected poems; we might almost say that one thing never spontaneously reminds him of another thing. He looks at objects, and values them for their own sakes, and for what they teach him—for their uses, for their beauty, for the witness they give of a merciful and gracious God. It is almost wonderful to observe how generally he dispenses with these decorations of poetry, as if in his republicanism he chose to throw off all such royal trappings and adventitious aids of state, and was resolved to stand forth in unrobed, uncrowned dignity. In his little poem called 'The Painted Cup,' a gay flower of his country, he thus deprecates the fancies it would naturally suggest.

> 'Now, if thou art a poet, tell me not
> That these bright chalices were tinted thus
> To hold the dew for fairies, when they meet
> On moonlight evenings in the hazel bowers,
> And dance till they are thirsty. Call not up,
> Amid this fresh and virgin solitude,
> The faded fancies of an elder world;
> But leave these scarlet cups to spotted moths
> Of June, and glistening flies, and humming-birds,
> To drink from, when on all these boundless lawns
> The morning sun looks hot. Or let the wind
> O'erturn in sport their ruddy brims, and pour
> A sudden shower upon the strawberry plant,
> To swell the reddening fruit, that even now
> Breathes a slight fragrance from the sunny slope.'—P. 334.

However, it must be owned that he has little genius as well as taste for simile. In the general absence of this ornament, we have three or four repetitions of the idea of the sky supported by pillars.

> 'Bright clouds, motionless pillars of the brazen heavens.'

> 'Beyond,
> Above the hills, in the blue distance rise
> The mighty columns with which earth props heaven.'

And in his poem on the Skies is the same thought, in the following harmonious stanza:—

'Though sunny Italy may boast
  The beauteous tints that flush her skies,
And lovely, round the Grecian coast,
  May thy blue pillars rise:
I only know how fair they stand
  Around my own beloved land.'—P. 143.

There is something in preeminence which will everywhere suggest the idea of the kingly state; so far we borrow from life when we desire to give distinction to any object of nature. The oak is the king of the forest, the rose is the queen of flowers, and 'Mont Blanc is the monarch of mountains, crowned long ago.' Mr. Bryant is once, by the pomp of autumn, startled so far from his democratic tendencies as to use the kingly image.

'The mountains that infold
In their wide sweep the colour'd landscape round,
Seem groups of giant kings, in purple and gold,
  That guard the enchanted ground.'—P. 111.

There is something grand in the sound, till we remember that kings never are to be seen in groups, and that they are exactly the last personages in the whole world to mount guard.

It is but fair to quote one happy exception to what we have been asserting, though this may be, as he professes the whole poem to be, the fruit of his friend's fancy, and not his own.

'Slow pass our days
In childhood, and the hours of light are long
Betwixt the morn and eve; with swifter lapse
They glide in manhood, and in age they fly;
Till days and seasons flit before the mind
As flit the snow-flakes in a winter storm,
Seen rather than distinguished.'

Inappropriate or inelegant similes are to be found in all literature, and are confined to no peculiar clime. It seems therefore invidious to attempt to illustrate our meaning by examples, but we think the following show a resolute aim at strength and effect, at the expense of correct taste, which makes them tell in one direction.

Percival in his description of the coral grove, lying calm and still beneath the ocean, surprises the reader with the following fierce image.

'There, with its waving blade of green,
The sea-flag streams through the silent water,
And the crimson leaf of the dulse is seen
To blush like a banner bathed in slaughter.'

He compares the last eager and fond embrace of a beautiful dying woman to a camel.

'So fondly the panting camel flies
Where the glassy vapour cheats his eyes.'

Whittier, when he wishes to express the beauty of the cloudless West at sunset, says,—

'Glorious as if a glimpse were given
Within the western gates of heaven,
Left, by the spirit of the star
Of sunset's holy hour, ajar!'

Mrs. Sigourney, in moralizing on the fire-side joys of winter, displays her learning thus:—

'Man should rest
'Thus from his fever'd passions, and exhale
The unbreath'd carbon of his festering thought,
And drink in holy health.'

There is spirit in the following simile of Longfellow's, which yet is inelegant and confused.

'In the world's broad field of battle,
In the bivouac of Life,
Be not like dumb, driven cattle,
Be a hero in the strife!'

Neal has this illustration:

'With form—all joy, and dance—as bright and free
As youthful nymph of mountain liberty,
Or naked angels dream'd by poesy.'

Emerson compares nature to a paroquet, thus:—

'And universal nature through her vast
And crowded whole, an infinite paroquet,
Repeats one cricket note.'

The winds remind one writer

'Of tones that wind around the vaulted roof,
And pointed arches, and retiring aisles
Of some old *lonely* minster, where the hand,
Skilful, and moved, with passionate love of art,
Plays on the higher keys.'

Not understanding that minsters in good repair, gifted with an organ and an organist, are always in populous haunts, and among the least *lonely* buildings in our land. This, however, only shows inaccuracy.

Mr. Willis, as 'the poet of society,' *must* have illustration, and there is no lack of it, though it is commonly of that received current fashion, exciting neither surprise, blame, nor admiration.

The first simile in the following stanza from 'Lines written to a Lady from Abroad,' is a happy natural thought, the two others common-place.

'The sad, sweet bells of twilight chime
Of many hearts may touch but one,
And to this seeming careless rhyme
Will whisper to thy heart alone.
I give it to the winds! The bird,
Let loose, to his far nest will flee;
And love, though breath'd but on a word,
Will find thee over land and sea.
Though clouds across the sky have driven,
We trust at last the star will shine,
And like the very light of heaven
I trust thy love. Trust thou in mine!'

We have to apologize, perhaps, for having so long omitted any formal mention of Longfellow, whose name must occur among the first to our thoughts in any mention of the poets of America. The turn of his mind, however, is towards European literature, and his poetry is formed on that model. He has translated with great success, both from German and Swedish poets, Tegner especially, and his longest original efforts are also from ancient Northern legends, and suggested by his visits to our continent. So that he is styled by some of his warmest admirers rather a German than an American. Thus his poetry has altogether a different tone from that of his countrymen. We should pronounce it richer in fancy and less clear in thought. His most recent work, Evangeline, is an American story of great pathos, and contains fine passages, but the metre in which he has chosen to write it, we confess has removed it from all our sympathies; we cannot care for a tale of unvarying sadness told in Hexameters, a measure which we believe the English ear will never be brought to tolerate in its own language. To us it is simply a masquerade and disguise—a sort of joke, and, therefore, most unfit for a melancholy theme. These are two striking and original similes;—the reader may differ from us as to the merits of the tune to which they are set.

'In the rear of the house, from the garden gate, ran a pathway
Through the great groves of oak to the skirts of the limitless prairie,
Into whose sea of flowers the sun was slowly descending:
Full in his track of light, like ships with shadowy canvas—
Hanging loose from their spars in a motionless calm in the tropics,
Stood a cluster of cotton trees with cordage of grape vines."

'As at the tramp of a horse's hoof on the turf of the prairies;
Far in advance are closed the leaves of the shrinking mimosa,
So at the hoof-beat of fate, with sad forebodings of evil,
Shrinks and closes the heart, ere the stroke of doom has attained it.'

The following lines (while we are on the subject of illustration) bear happily on what we have said of that universal tendency to seek in nature for parallels to our human life. They are by the same author, and show great fertility.

MAIDENHOOD.

'Maiden! with the meek, brown eyes,
In whose orbs a shadow lies,
Like the dusk in evening skies!

Thou, whose locks outshine the sun,
Golden tresses, wreathed in one,
As the braided streamlets run!

Standing, with reluctant feet,
Where the brook and river meet!
Womanhood and childhood fleet!

Gazing, with a timid glance,
On the brooklet's swift advance,
On the river's broad expanse!

Deep and still, that gliding stream
Beautiful to thee must seem,
As the river of a dream.

Then, why pause with indecision
When bright angels in thy vision
Beckon thee to fields Elysian?

Seest thou shadows sailing by,
As the dove, with startled eye,
Sees the falcon's shadow fly?

Hear'st thou voices on the shore,
That our ears perceive no more,
Deafen'd by the cataract's roar?

O, thou child of many prayers!
Life hath quicksands,—Life hath snares!
Care and age come unawares!

Like the swell of some sweet tune,
Morn is risen into noon,
May glides onward into June.

Childhood is the bough where slumber'd
Buds and blossoms many-number'd;—
Age, that bough with snows encumber'd.

Gather, then, each flower that grows,
When the young heart overflows,
To embalm that tent of snows.

Bear a lily in thy hand;
Gates of brass cannot withstand
One touch of that magic wand.

Bear through sorrow, wrong, and ruth,
In thy heart the dew of youth,
On thy lips the smile of truth.

Oh, that dew like balm shall steal
Into wounds that cannot heal,
Even as sleep our eyes doth seal;

And that smile, like sunshine, dart
Into many a sunless heart
For a smile of God thou art.'

One long established old-world simile, we find pleasantly combated by Albert Greene in his lines on 'The Weathercock of our Steeple.' There he endeavours to give that useful public servant a character for consistency, contrary to all precedent. We own ourselves shaken by his whole argument, but must confine ourselves to extracting the four closing stanzas—

'Men have no right to make thy name
A by-word for their deeds:—
They change their friends, their principles,
Their fashions, and their creeds:
Whilst thou hast ne'er, like them, been known
Thus causelessly to range;
But when thou *changest sides*, can'st give
Good reasons for the change.

Thou, like some lofty soul, whose course
The thoughtless oft condemn,
Art touch'd by many airs from heaven
Which never breathe on them,—
And moved by many impulses
Which they do never know,
Who round their earth-bound circles, plod,
The dusty paths below.

Through one more dark and cheerless night
  Thou well hast kept thy trust,
And now in glory o'er thy head
  The morning light has burst.
And unto earth's true watcher, thus,
  When his dark hours have pass'd,
Will come the "day-spring from on high,"
  To cheer his path at last.

Bright symbol of *fidelity*,
  Still may I think of thee;
And may the lesson thou dost teach
  Be never lost on me;—
But still in sunshine or in storm,
  Whatever task is mine,
May I be faithful to *my* trust.
  As thou hast been to *thine*.'

Of that second aspect of 'Nature as reflected in the Feelings of Mankind,' not simply shown to us as in a picture, nor yet as a lesson, we could no doubt give our readers some happy examples: the following from Longfellow, though an unambitious one, has no doubt found an echo in many a breast on a rainy day.

THE RAINY DAY.

'The day is cold, and dark, and dreary;
It rains, and the wind is never weary;
The vine still clings to the mouldering wall,
But at every gust the dead leaves fall,
    And the day is dark and dreary.

My life is cold, and dark, and dreary;
It rains, and the wind is never weary;
My thoughts still cling to the mouldering past,
But the hopes of youth fall thick in the blast,
    And the days are dark and dreary.

Be still, sad heart, and cease repining;
Behind the clouds is the sun still shining;
Thy fate is the common fate of all:
Into each life some rain must fall,
    Some days must be dark and dreary.'

Of that still deeper sympathy which some modern writers seek in nature—as it were forcing her into harmony with their own frame of feeling, and thus placing her in a debateable ground between reality and fancy, we can find but few instances. The following lines remind us of Tennyson, without being an imitation. They are from the pen of Edgar Poe, a writer apparently of not much note, but are yet striking. The dreamy charm is broken somewhat painfully towards the end, by the direct mention of one feature of dissolution, which is characteristic of his countrymen's want of delicacy, or, as they would think, absence of squeamishness in such matters.

THE SLEEPER.

'At midnight in the month of June,
I stand beneath the mystic moon.
An opiate vapour, dewy, dim,
Exhales from out her golden rim,
And softly dripping, drop by drop,
Upon the quiet mountain-top,
Steals drowsily and musically
Into the universal valley.
The rosemary nods upon the grave;
The lily lolls upon the wave;
Wrapping the mist about its breast,
The ruin moulders into rest;
Looking like Lethe, see, the lake
A conscious slumber seems to take,
And would not for the world awake.
All beauty sleeps!—and, lo! where lies,
With casement open to the skies,
Irene and her destinies!

Oh, lady bright, can it be right,
This lattice open to the night?
The bodiless airs, and wizard rout,
Flit through the chamber, in and out,
And wave the curtain-canopy,
So fitfully, so fearfully,
Above the closed and fringed lid,
'Neath which thy slumbering soul lies hid,
That o'er the floor and down the wall,
Like ghosts the shadows rise and fall.
Oh, lady dear, hast thou no fear?
Why, and what art thou dreaming here?
Sure thou art come o'er far-off seas,
A wonder to our garden trees!
Strange is thy pallor—strange thy dress—
Stranger thy glorious length of tress,
And this all-solemn silentness!

The lady sleeps. Oh, may her sleep,
Which is enduring, so be deep!
Soft may the worms about her creep!
This bed being changed for one more holy,
This room for one more melancholy,
I pray to God that she may lie
For ever thus with closed eye!
My love, she sleeps. Oh, may her sleep,
As it is lasting, so be deep!
Heaven have her in its sacred keep!
Far in the forest, dim and old,
For her may some tall tomb unfold—
Some tomb that oft hath flung its black
And wing-like pannels, fluttering back,
Triumphant o'er the crested palls
Of her grand family funerals,—
Some sepulchre, remote, alone,
Against whose portal she hath thrown,
In childhood, many an idle stone,—
Some vault from out whose sounding door
She ne'er shall force an echo more,
Nor thrill to think, poor child of sin,
It was the dead who groaned within.'

One nation has hardly a right to criticise another on the score of its humour. Wherever humour so far hits the taste of its hearers or readers as to amuse them innocently and harmlessly, it has some of the genuine properties of fun about it, and does its part. If it is not addressed to us, it is not to the point that we find it dull. We are only in the condition of those who have a good story reported to them without the charm of the original speaker's voice and manner, which were half the battle. It is certain of most humour and satire, that they only please their own audience and their own day. People talk of Rabelais and his Pantagruelism, but we believe it to be a piece of mere antiquarianism, to pretend to be amused by him. His greatest admirer would gladly lay him down for a good number of 'Punch.' Who can tolerate Peter Pindar now, who once made all the world laugh? Mere humour must appeal to something higher and more general than the interest of its own times to be remembered beyond them. Therefore we state it only as a matter of fact, that we have not been much diverted by the specimens of American fun which we have seen. Halleck is highly valued for this quality by his countrymen, and perhaps we could understand him best. His poems have what such poetry ought to have—a great local reputation. Bryant, too, has written a warm eulogy on the varied merits of his style. In his 'Connecticut,' he manifests a sympathy half genuine half satirical with the views political and religious of his nation—that country 'where breathes no castled lord or cabined slave,' which make it amusing to others besides his countrymen.

'And where none kneel, save when to Heaven they pray;
Nor even then, unless in their own way.

* * * *

A justice of the peace, for the time being,
They bow to, but may turn him out next year:
They reverence their priest, but disagreeing
In price or creed, dismiss him without fear.'

We have already given a specimen of Oliver Holmes's wit, and could quote others not much more to our taste. Bryant sometimes indulges in what he intends for gentle badinage on his countrywomen, but is apt to turn play into earnest, and from airy compliments rushes suddenly into the gravest charges; as, for example, on the subjects of rouge and false curls—temptations, if we may trust his cynical insinuations, to which his fair compatriots appear peculiarly liable. Many a 'tint of rose' breathing modesty's own hue, has, however, been so misjudged: we are, therefore, always slow in giving credence to such aspersions. There is a certain style of jest, of which we never could see the merit, which consists in composing an elaborate poem in one spirit,—serious, or sentimental, or romantic; and knocking down the fabric thus raised by the last line. If the reader is taken in by the opening, the closing antithesis can hardly fail to disgust. If we remain cold to the sentiment, the whole point of the joke is lost. Halleck is considered a great adept in this art, and Mr. Willis also furnishes more than one example. He has some stanzas entitled 'The Broken Bracelet,' where a strain of tender reflections on the fair wearer is concluded by the home question, "What the fellow 'll charge to mend.'

With Mr. Willis we have, however, a graver quarrel, while on the subject of the gayer and lighter styles of verse, than on what we esteem want of taste. His volume, as we have shown, opens with sketches from Scripture, written in a careless, though not an intentionally irreverent spirit. It closes with a story of deliberate bad principle and cold-hearted playing with evil.

It is composed on the model of some of Byron's worst effusions, and as a work of art, is a poor imitation of a bad thing. Mr. Willis evidently desires to be considered the finest gentleman of his class; he is emphatically styled, 'the 'poet of society, familiar with the secret springs of action in 'social life, and moved himself by the same influences which guide his fellows.' He has been much in Europe, and is now anxious to prove his acquaintance with high life—(a weakness of mankind at large, from which his countrymen are said not to be exempt), and his consequent emancipation from old-fashioned rules of right and wrong, which we must say are not commonly forgotten by his brother poets. How he has succeeded in his portraiture of English fashionable manners, a brief abstract of the story will show. It is entitled 'The Lady Jane, or the Old Maid's Love,' and opens after the fashion of the epic, by giving the grand leading subject of the poem:

'There was a lady—fair, and forty too,
Loved by a youth of scarcely two-and-twenty.'

We are often told of the transience of charms across the Atlantic. Our poet bears the following testimony to their durability in our more genial clime.

'And loveliness may drive through Piccadilly
Changeless till fifty, if no pangs befall.'

The Lady Jane had the good fortune to breathe this balmy air. Her father, the earl, for no reason given, refused all offers for his beautiful heiress, nor did she resist or lament his decision. Thus years passed on, 'untroubled by debt, lovers, or affliction,' and thirty came upon her unawares, startling and saddening her, till a glance at her mirror reconciles her.

'"Time after all," she said, "a harmless flirt is,"
And from that time took kindly to her thirties.'

Another stanza carries her on in undiminished beauty,

'Till like a dream came forty.'

On that day she took some wise resolutions; and though her glass still gives witness to no change, she resolutely alters the fashion of her bonnets, and the height of her dresses, to the despair of her maid, and sets out on a series of calls on her dowager acquaintance, to learn from them what

'Solaces of age were *comme il faut.*'

Hitherto we can only commend the gentle strength of mind of our heroine, but unhappily her last call and its consequences upsets the wisdom of forty years. This visit is on a certain countess, who is introduced to us in an apartment so elegant and unique, that several stanzas are devoted to its description. Indeed, Mr. Willis always exhibits a prodigious passion for furniture hangings, and all the upholsterer paraphernalia. The ancient mistress of this paradise unites in her person, authoress, *belle-esprit,* philosopher, and beauty, and does not appear worthy of much respect in any of these capacities. Her advice—fatal advice! is to keep a pet poet; whereupon, quite *apropos*, she produces a letter, received that morning from an old friend, commending her son to her keeping and good auspices, and describing him with all the glow of a mother's fondness. In this portrait our author exhibits a tenderness which betrays, we cannot but think, a certain personal interest, so close is his sympathy with the youth's tastes, from poetry down to lemon-coloured gloves. This fair ideal has been educated in some remote place on the coast of France, and now,

> 'His father sends him forth for fame and gold—
> An angel on this errand!'

He has not yet been seen by the countess, but arrives at Mivart's that day. In the evening, Lady Jane attends the countess's *soirée*, of all the ceremonies of which there is a minute account, for the benefit, we suppose, of American readers, who may wish to know what high life is in England. And here we would beg them to discriminate. They may entirely trust our author in his account of the cloak room—the fat housekeeper pouring out the tea, 'the fresh lit candles,' and the new blown 'what do ye call 'ems,' on the stairs, the graceful page and stiff footman—all these may be seen not only within the charmed precincts of Piccadilly, but beyond; but we must entreat them to withhold their belief from what follows. When the fair and discreet Lady Jane gets upstairs, the hostess is not there, for the guest is early—half-past ten; so she wanders about by herself, and enters the conservatory. In the midst behold our angel poet, Jules,

> 'In a chair,
> Sleeping as if his eyelids had been moons,
> Reclined, with flakes of sunshine in his hair,
> (Or what looked like it,) a fair youth, quite real,
> But of a beauty like the Greek ideal.'
>
> * * * *
>
> The lady Jane gazed on the fair boy sleeping,
> And in his lip's rare beauty read his name;
> And to his side with breathless wonder creeping,
> Resistless to her heart the feeling came,
> That, to her yearning love's devoted keeping,
> Was given the gem within that fragile frame.
> And, bending, with almost a mother's bliss,
> To his bright lips, she seal'd it with a kiss!'—P. 369.

Jules has 'that precious quality called tact,' and wakes up not the least surprised. The countess enters about the same moment, and he apologizes with a most unconscious air for having been asleep. From that time the Lady Jane devotes herself to Jules Beaulevres—*on ne s'arrête pas en si beau chemin;* and an acquaintance distinguished by so striking a commencement was not suffered to flag. She lionizes him, shows him London, the Coliseum, the Panoramas, the Zoological Gardens, sends him home-made bread, with many other extraordinary attentions, which we will not detail; she 'keeps him in kid gloves, cologne, and flannels,' stays unreasonably late at parties for the sake of setting him down 'on her way *chez-elle*,' introduces him to waltzing partners, gets him into clubs, and follows him to Wormwood Scrubs when he fights a duel: and he, in return, condescends to spend his mornings in her sumptuous boudoir, till it is time to ride in the Park. In spite of

' The magic spell he bore,
The earnest truth upon his lips impressed,'—

we see nothing in this hero but the utmost selfishness of which the heart is capable; and we fully believe it is this quality which really captivates his biographer, as giving its possessors the last polish of refinement, and a fascination peculiarly their own.

' His beau ideal was to sink the attic,
  (Though not by birth, or taste, "the *salt* above")
To pitilessly cut the air erratic
  Which ladies, fond of authors, so much love,
And be in style, calm, cold, aristocratic—
  Serene in faultless boots and primrose glove.
But the exclusive's made of starch, not honey!
And Jules was cordial, joyous, frank, and funny.

This was one secret of his popularity,
  Men hate a manner colder than their own,
And ladies—bless their hearts!—love chaste hilarity
  Better than sentiment—if truth were known!
And Jules had one more slight peculiarity—
  He'd little "approbativeness"—or none;—
And what the critics said concerned him little—
Provided it touched not his drink and victual.'

Jules has two hearts, 'all poets being double, and living in two worlds, fancy and fact;' and, all things considered, it was convenient to give one of these to Lady Jane. But after a time he accompanies her and her father, now in his dotage, to Rome, where Mr. Willis expatiates a great deal on a variety of topics, and where Jules encounters a beautiful Italian marchioness, almost a child, whose husband receives him with much kindness. For this lady he presently deserts his elder flame, who, feeling herself neglected, in order to test his constancy announces that her father was ordered sea air, and that they were off to Venice. It was a false move, for Jules 'would stay.' But this cruel decision gives our author a grand occasion for a display of high life and good breeding. Both parties are so polite, and so cool. Jules says, 'I think not;' Lady Jane, with a volcano of suppressed feelings, and a breaking heart, will not be behindhand in composure;

> 'For rank has one cold law of Moloch's making,—
> Death before outcry, while the heart is breaking!'

Of course there is no more happiness for her; as a necessary homage to the young poet's attractions, her life henceforth is cold and lonely.

> 'A star, on which a spirit had alighted
> Once, in all time, were like a heart so blighted!'

Our readers, however, will be relieved to hear that 'Jules was not made of stuff to die of grieving,' and the author concludes with this comfortable assurance, and a sort of promise to continue his adventures. We have attempted to give some slight abstract of the story, but have conveyed little idea of the style, which would call for too much space. It is made up of those disjointed sentences, distorted rhymes, startling addresses, parentheses, puns, flippancies, reflections, glimpses of the great world, and of the author's individual fancies, profane allusions and perverted texts, which are the received flowers and graces of the sentimental-comic poem of fashionable life.

We ought again to apologize for devoting so much time to so worthless a subject; but Mr. Willis's name is well known in England, where some of his poetry has a deserved reputation; a leading place has been given to him among the poets of his country; and his prose works—of which this last effusion of his genius must have forcibly reminded our readers—have been extensively read; these circumstances have invested the story with a consequence which its literary merits would no more have earned for it than its moral ones.

In a notice short and incomplete as this must necessarily be, there is at once a fear of prolonging the subject unduly, and of omitting the mention of names which ought by no means to be overlooked in the most cursory survey of American poetry. Bishop Doane, Creswell, Arthur Cleveland Coxe, as Churchmen, and other authors whose writings evidence sound and definite views, though Mr. Griswold leaves us in ignorance of their 'persuasion,' seem to demand particular attention; but their writings are not of that marked character to present examples of any particular style; and to transcribe whole poems, however pleasing both in expression and sentiment, would carry our notice quite beyond the proper limits of an article. For the same reason, we can do little more than enumerate the names of other writers, highly valued by their countrymen. Dana, whose 'Buccaneer' and other poems have won him an American reputation; Hoffman and Morris, the song-writers of their country;

Leggett, Ware, Willcox, Sims, Clarke, &c., but who are little known or read beyond it.

Of female authors America may boast its full share. It is the aim of education there, more than with us, to give early facility in composition; and thus a barrier is broken down which hinders, consciously or unconsciously, many a young imagination from pouring out its thick-coming fancies. It is evidently less an effort in America than it is in England to become an authoress. Mrs. Sigourney's name has long been familiar with the English world, where her shorter pieces are valued for their grace and sweetness. The well-known lines on 'The Death of an Infant' have a wide popularity, which dispenses with the need of our quoting them here as a favourable example of her style. 'Mrs. Sigourney,' says Mr. Griswold, 'has surpassed any of the 'poets of her sex in this country, in the extent of her productions; and their religious and domestic character has made them 'popular with the large classes who regard more than artistic 'merit, the spirit and tendency of what they read. Her subjects 'are varied, and her diction generally melodious and free; but 'her works are written too carelessly, they lack vigour and condensation, and possess but few of the elements of enduring 'verse. Very little poetry, save that of scholars, finished with 'extreme care and skill, belongs to the permanent literature of 'any language.' It may be politic to say so, and thus to convey a useful hint; but we are disposed to think that if a lady cannot write poetry without a classical education, she will hardly do so with one. It is no more desirable that women should *write* like men, than that they should *be* like them. As it is not in their nature to be learned, in the severe sense of the word, if they become so it is commonly at the cost, or to the injury, of gifts especially feminine—more particularly of that tact and discernment which may be called instinct in women, and which laborious cultivation of the intellectual powers confuses or extinguishes in this case, as in that of instincts generally. One American lady, however, has braved this danger. 'Mrs. Brooks,' says Mr. Griswold, 'is the only American poet of her sex whose 'mind is thoroughly educated. She is familiar with the literature 'of Greece, Rome, and the Oriental nations, and with the languages 'and letters of Southern Europe;—learning, brilliant imagination, masculine boldness of thought and diction, are characteristics of her works.' Nor is Maria del Occidente (the name by which she was introduced to the English world) indebted for such lofty praise only to her countrymen. Our own Southey pronounced her 'the most impassioned and imaginative of all poetesses,' and characterizes her 'Zophiel, or the Bride of Seven,' as one of the most remarkable productions of female genius. It is hard to be just to the merits of what we do not like, and we certainly do not like 'Zophiel;' yet with real efforts at impartiality, we must acknowledge ourselves perplexed by Mr. Southey's high-sounding panegyric, and can neither see genuine passion, nor genuine imagination, in this lady's turgid flighty efforts of fancy, for so they rather appear to us. In differing from such high authority, we are driven in self-defence to suggest that the poet may himself but recently have descended from the realms of Pandalon and Swerga's heavenly heights—or was still giddy from 'Veeshnoo's thousand years' descent,' and 'the ten myriad years the aspiring Brama soared,' visions which we can well conceive would incapacitate a man for a time for sober criticism. 'Zophiel, or the Bride of Seven,' is founded on the history of Sarah, in the book of Tobit, and Zophiel is the demon Asmodeus—made as interesting and attractive as his delineator knows how; but in spite of this novel hero, and the high qualities the author brings in her work, Mr. Griswold admits that the poem will never be very popular, for which, we think, the public should not be blamed. Mankind does indeed revolt from all such sympathies, and the world is quite right not to care for a demon in love. Every spark of true earthly love has a touch of heaven in it; how, then, can we, even for a moment, sympathize in Asmodeus' impure fires? Our readers will see that the subject is certainly not a feminine one, nor is the writer's mode of treating it; still it is the very reverse of masculine—never were more milk-and-water demons. They have white arms and white feet, and rainbow-tinted wings, and blue eyes; and they kiss, and embrace, and prose together, like the most harmless of mortals. Zophiel the hero, a fiend of spirit and energy, is fortunate in a friend, the milder Phraerion, of so dull and gentle a temper 'that he scarcely felt his banishment' from heaven. However, from a habit he has of listening, he makes the fiery Zophiel a most incomparable confidant, and they talk over the heroine in a way which certainly makes us wonder why the author should have thought it necessary to search the infernal regions for a hero. 'I but live to prove a love for her, as harmless as sincere.' 'I 'charm her ear with songs she never heard before.' 'I leave her 'for my needful cares, at leisure to muse upon, and feed her 'lonely state.' 'Egla looks on me, doubtful and amused.' Thus discreetly does the fiend express himself. Sometimes, however, the demon peeps out, but still with few terrors.

'Soul, what a mystery thou art! not one
  Admires, or loves, or worships virtue more
Than I; but passion hurls me on, till torn
  By keen remorse, I cool, to curse me and deplore.'

Whether, however, these lost spirits rave or talk sentiment, whether they sit on a broken column by moonlight, or dive to the gnomes' palace in the depths of ocean—the author never appears to us to take a genuine flight of her own; we are alternately reminded of Pope's Sylphs, or Moore's 'Loves of the Angels,' or Southey's more extravagant imaginations, all dressed up now and then in the golden light of the ballet, that great repository and freshener of the fancy. We can never see anything to be called in any good sense imagination; even the long strings of hard names are not new, though they may be learned.

> 'On either side
> Fierce Aishalat and Pshaamayim went.
> Bright Ramaour followed on, in order meet;
> Then Nahalcoul and Zotzaraven, best
> Beloved, save Rouamasak of perfume sweet;
> Then Talhazak and Marmorak.'

The perpetual recurrence of these terrific proper names, would in themselves prevent any poem being read. However, fiends are not the only personages in the narrative, and there are Egla's (for so Sarah's name is changed) seven lovers to be described, all of different aspects and various graces. But besides the painful impropriety of making this use of a Scriptural subject, only augmented by the *mode* of treating it, the circumstances of the story itself deprive it of the power to interest. In the Bible narrative our sympathies are called forth for Tobias alone. Seven lovers circumstantially described, and the bride's feelings successively aroused and excited, form a subject which we feel satisfied no writer of genuine feeling or knowledge of the heart could have chosen. But our controversy with Mr. Southey has carried us to a much greater length than we intended.

Before proceeding to the last name on our list we must preface our remarks by a general testimony to the intelligibility of American authors—no slight praise, and which, as we review them, seems to grow into a national characteristic. Throughout Mr. Griswold's book, through Bryant's and Willis's large and handsome volumes, we can hardly recal an occasion when it was necessary to re-peruse a passage once read with due care and attention. This of course implies that the American poet's mind does not take a deep or speculative turn, that it moralizes on the outward form of things, and does not curiously penetrate into the hidden mysteries of our being; that the manifestations rather than the secret springs of our moral nature are their subject. But many an English poet is obscure who has no right to be so from the profundity of his ideas; and we must admit that the American sees his way clearly, and expresses himself distinctly, on occasions when many of our own much respected modern writers would have involved themselves and their readers in a cloud requiring some straining of the mental vision to penetrate. The resource of an American poet whose powers of expression fail him, and who cannot reduce his confused thoughts and fancies into order, is to be prosaic; with us, the refuge too often is obscurity. He, as it were, gives the matter up, and confesses his misfortune, or undervalues what he cannot attain; the artifice of reducing the reader to his own state of mystification does not apparently suggest itself to him. Percival, for instance, who evidently supposes himself to possess what Mr. Griswold attributes to him, 'all the natural qualities of a great poet, but wanting the artistic skill,' depreciates expression altogether, confuses the mere feeling of poetry with the art poetic—the power of being impressed, with the gift of impressing. He says poetry

'Is not the chime and flow of words, that move
In measured file, and metrical array;

* * * * *

'Tis a mysterious feeling.'

So again:—

'The poetic feeling needs no words
To give it utterance;

* * * * *

Its seat is deeper in the savage breast,
Than in the man of cities;'

and so on. We do not agree with what he says—but throughout a long poem on an intricate subject, his expression is always as clear as if it were a simple narrative of facts; his thoughts may be inaccurate, but his statement of them is distinct. Again, Mr. Cranch, in lines which please us very much, speaks of the inevitable shortcoming of words, and any mode of expression in this mortal state, in language of praiseworthy perspicuity; though we should guess, from other examples of his poetry, that he is one of the imaginative multitude who seem only to want that little despised talent, that slight accidental quality of expression, to be great poets.

'Thought is deeper than all speech;
Feeling deeper than all thought:
Souls to souls can never teach
What unto themselves was taught.

We are spirits clad in veils:
Man by man was never seen:
All our deep communing fails
To remove the shadowy screen.

Heart to heart was never known:
Mind with mind did never meet:
We are columns left alone,
Of a temple once complete.

Like the stars that gem the sky,
Far apart, though seeming near,
In our light we scattered lie;
All is thus but starlight here.

What is social company,
But a babbling summer-stream?
What our wise philosophy
But the glancing of a dream?

Only when the sun of love
Melts the scatter'd stars of thought,
Only when we live above
What the dim-eyed world hath taught,

Only when our souls are fed
By the Fount which gave them birth,
And by inspiration led,
Which they never drew from earth;

We, like parted drops of rain,
Swelling till they meet and run,
Shall be all absorbed again,
Melting, flowing into one.

In estimating thus highly the quality of intelligibility, we would not, of course, be supposed to touch upon that noblest class of poetry which, treating of the deepest subjects which can occupy the mind, cannot be read without profound attention, nor mastered on a first perusal. We would not rank ourselves among those so happily satirized by 'The Great Reasoner,' 'who take for granted that they are acquainted with every-'thing; and that no subject, if treated in the manner it should 'be, can be treated in any manner but what is familiar and 'easy to them.' But the same writer goes on to say, 'Con-'fusion and perplexity in writing is, indeed, without excuse, 'because any one may, if he pleases, know whether he under-'stands and sees through what he is about; and it is unpardon-'able for a man to lay his thoughts before others, when he is 'conscious that he himself does not know whereabouts he is, or 'how the matter before him stands. It is coming abroad in a 'disorder, which he ought to be dissatisfied to find himself in at 'home.' We wonder what Bishop Butler would have thought of Emerson's poems, the author of which forms so great an exception to the perspicuity we have been commending, that his green and gold volume may be compared to a corner into which has been swept all the dust and cobwebs of obscurity his tidier countrymen have been so careful to rid themselves of.

Mr. Emerson is known to all the world as a lecturer—the preacher and writer of a new philosophy. Such of his thoughts as are beyond the flight of prose, he has put into verse, and published in the wonderful volume before us, where they excite the idolatrous worship of his admirers, who think it slight honour indeed, to place him at the head of the poets of his country; while, to us, much of these same compositions appears the most unequivocal nonsense which was ever gravely brought before the world. It is, however, a subject on which it is hard to dispute, from the difficulty of finding common ground. Hitherto, it has been considered a form of censure to pronounce a poem to be without meaning, a charge to be rebutted by those approving it; but, in this case, Mr. Emerson's followers admit it with a coolness which must be almost called complacency, as if it were a 'slow' thing to talk so as to be understood. 'Who understands a robin,' say they, 'or the hum of bagpipes?' But the cause of nonsense has been so ably urged by its advocates, that we should do it injustice to give our own interpretation of their views. We will therefore extract the following from a recent announcement of 'The Coming Man:'—

> 'And first of his little volume of poems. They are not wholes, but extracts, from the volume of his mind. They are, as he truly calls some of them, "Wood-notes," as beautiful, changeful, capricious, and unfathom-

able often, as the song of the birds. On hearing such notes, we sometimes ask ourselves, "What *says* that song which has lapped us in such delicious reverie, and made us almost forget the music in the sweet thoughts which are suggested by it?" Vain the question, for is not the suggestion of such sweet thoughts saying enough, saying all that it was needed to say? It is the bird that speaks—our own soul alone can furnish the interpretation. So with many of the poems of Emerson. They mean absolutely nothing—they are mere nonsense-verses—except to those who have learned their cypher, and whose heart instinctively dances to their tune. It is often a wordless music—a wild wailing rhythm—a sound inexplicable, but no more absurd or meaningless than the note of the flute, or the thrill of the mountain bagpipe. Who would, or who, though willing, could translate into common—into *all* language, that train of thought and emotion, long as the life of the soul, and wide as the curve of the sphere, which one inarticulate melody can awaken in the mind? So some of Emerson's verses float us away, listening and lost, on their stream of sound and of dim suggestive meaning. Led himself, as he repeatedly says, "as far as the incommunicable," he leads us into the same mystic region.'

We are inclined to think a poet's mission to be something higher than a bird's or a harp's, but at least it is different. It is his gift to express new and deep thought; and we hold it to be a mere confession of incapacity for him to say that he has ideas beyond his powers of expression. So we all think; all persons whose minds are active, yet vague and indistinct, (the ordinary condition of readers,) feel the same; they have glimpses and guesses at something higher than they can reach, and it is this half-perception of the common mind which the poet enlightens. We do not acknowledge a man to be worthy of the title who only puts into indistinct dreamy words our indistinct dreamy ideas; but we hail him as a teacher, an exponent of truth and nature, who sees so clearly, that he gives form to the vapours and mists of our minds. Poetry of the highest order delights, because it brings to light the obscure that has hitherto vexed us, the vague which has so far eluded our grasp. We dwell upon what his imagination has bodied forth; we have gained something not known or realized before; and from age to age gifted men arise, thus developing, harmonizing, expanding. But of such are not those turbid and restless souls who write because they are perplexed, not because some great truth burns within them; who expect to clear the doubts of their own minds by setting them down on paper, as if words put in order would grow into ordered ideas. Mr. Emerson, we are convinced, must read his own poems with much the same expectation which leads on his sympathizing readers: in the hope that some new light may flash out of them, giving form to this chaos. It is said that artists of defective imagination are in the habit of dashing a sponge against their muddy uninspired canvas, anticipating that, in the splash and squander of colours, accident may reveal some happy conjunction of towers, and rocks, and sunbeams, which their own unassisted genius could not conceive. Mr. Emerson often appears to us to try the same experiment with pen and ink; his eye must glance over his work when he has done, to see what it has turned into. But it is time to support our assertions by example; and to escape the fashionable charge of 'garbled extracts,' we will quote a whole poem, long though it be.

URIEL.

'It fell in the ancient periods
Which the brooding soul surveys,
Or ever the wild Time coined itself
Into calendar months and days.

This was the lapse of Uriel,
Which in Paradise befel.
Once among the Pleiads walking,
SAID overheard the young gods talking,
And the treason too long pent
To his ears was evident.
The young deities discussed
Laws of form and metre just,
Orb, quintessence, and sunbeams,
What subsisteth, and what seems.
One, with low tones that decide,
And doubt and reverend use defied,
With a look that solved the sphere,
And stirred the devils everywhere,
Gave his sentiment divine
Against the being of a line:
"Line in nature is not found,
Unit and universe are round;
In vain produced, all rays return,
Evil will bless, and ice will burn."
As Uriel spoke with piercing eye,
A shudder ran around the sky;
The stern old war-gods shook their heads,
The seraphs frown'd from myrtle-beds;
Seemed to the holy festival,
The rash word boded ill to all;
The balance-beam of Fate was bent;
The bonds of good and ill were rent;
Strong Hades could not keep his own,
But all slid in confusion.

A sad self-knowledge withering fell
On the beauty of Uriel.
In heaven once eminent, the god
Withdrew that hour into his cloud,
Whether doomed to long gyration
In the sea of generation,
Or by knowledge grown too bright
To hit the nerve of feebler light.
Straightway a forgetting wind
Stole over the celestial kind,
And their lips the secret kept,
If in ashes the fire-seed slept.
But now and then truth-speaking things
Shamed the angels' veiling wings,
And, shrilling from the solar course,
Or from fruit of chemic force,
Procession of a soul in matter,
Or the speeding change of water,
Or out of the good of evil born,
Came Uriel's voice of cherub scorn,
And a blush ting'd the upper sky,
And the gods shook they knew not why.'[1] P. 18.

We could go on multiplying instances, but if we have been withheld by our limits from quoting sense, the argument has

---

[1] This style is not so new as it may appear, except for the superior continuity which a pervading profaneness seems to give to Mr. Emerson's poem. We can trace a strong resemblance in what we have quoted with what follows from the pen of Dr. Corbet, written some two hundred years ago.

'Mark how the lanterns cloud mine eyes,
See where the moon-drake 'gins to rise;
Saturn crawls much like an iron cat
To see the naked moon in a slip-shod hat.
Thunder-thumping toad-stools crack the pans,
To see the mermaids tumble;
Leather cat-a-mountains shake their heels,
To hear the gosh-hawk grumble.

The

greater force still against a tide of nonsense. We will therefore only refer our readers to 'The Visit,' 'Earth Song,' 'Mithridates,' 'Etienne de la Boèce,' 'The Sphynx,'—indeed, to a good part of the volume, if it falls in his way. But there is much beside nonsense in Mr. Emerson's book, though this may be its grand feature, on a first glance. With some fine speeches in compliment to an undefined religion, and some of its professors, it is a directly infidel work, as distinct pantheism as, we believe, has yet made its appearance amongst us. Some of our readers are perhaps aware that, in his lectures, Mr. Emerson has expressed his view of the nature of evil, its inevitable though indirect tendency to good, in such a form, and illustrated by such examples, as make his statement unfit for our pages. His poems are full of intimations of this same sentiment with more decency of expression.

'Yet spake yon purple mountain,
  Yet said yon ancient wood,
That night or day, that love or *crime*,
  Lead all souls to the Good.'—P. 103.

  'Higher far
Upward into the pure realm
  Over sun or star,
Over the flickering Dæmon film
Thou must mount for love,—
* * * *
Where unlike things are like,
Where good and ill,
And joy and moan,
Melt into one.'—P. 137.

One long poem professes to be spoken by a fir-tree, on which his eulogist says, 'He seems (particularly in his "Wood-notes") an inspired tree, his veins full of sap instead of blood; and you take up his volume of poems, clad as it is in green, and smell to it as to a fresh leaf.' We cannot here agree with Mr. Gilfillan; to us, the fir-tree's speech is very like Mr. Emerson, and not at all like a tree. Any one who has listened to the harmonies of a breeze-stirred pine, 'its springs and dying gales,' will at least feel certain that its music-loving branches would sing in a well-ordered solemn measure; with variety there would be

---

  The rustic threed
  Begins to bleed,
And cobweb's elbows itches;
  The putrid skies
  Eat mulsack pies,
Back'd up in logic breeches.'

The doctor has the modesty to call his lines a non-sequitur, a more appropriate title for many of Mr. Emerson's than he has himself chosen; indeed, the headings of these poems seem quite as much a matter of chance as their contents.

a sweet monotony, an undersong, which these lines are especially wanting in. We quote the following lines, however, for the sentiments, which merit deeper censure than the versification.

'From the heart of God proceeds,
A single will, a million deeds.
Once slept the world an egg of stone,
And pulse, and sound, and light was none;
And God said, Throb; and there was motion,
And the vast mass became vast ocean.
Onward, and on, the eternal Pan,
Who layeth the world's incessant plan,
Halteth never in one shape,
But for ever doth escape,
Like wave or flame, into new forms
Of gem, and air, of plant and worms.
I, that to-day am a pine,
Yesterday was a bundle of grass.
He is free and libertine,
Pouring of his power the wine
To every age, to every race,
Unto every race and age
He emptieth the beverage;
Unto each, and unto all,
Maker and original.
The world is the ring of his spells,
And the play of his miracles.
As he giveth to all to drink,
Thus or thus they are and think.
He giveth little or giveth much,
To make them several or such.
With one drop sheds form and feature,
With the second a special nature;
The third adds heat's indulgent spark,
The fourth gives light which eats the dark.
In the fifth drop himself he flings,
And conscious Law is King of Kings.
Pleaseth him the Eternal child
To play his sweet will, glad and wild;
As the bee through the garden ranges,
From world to world the godhead changes;
As the sheep go feeding through the waste,
From form to form he maketh haste.
This vault which glows immense with light
Is the inn where he lodges for a night.
What recks such Traveller if the bowers
Which bloom and fade like summer flowers,
A bunch of fragrant lilies be,
Or the stars of eternity?
Alike to him the better, the worse,
The glowing angel, the outcast corse.
Thou metest him by centuries,
And lo! he passes like the breeze.
Thou seek'st in globe and galaxy,
He hides in pure transparency;
Thou askest in fountains and in fires,
He is the essence that inquires.
He is the axis of the star;
He is the sparkle of the spar;
He is the heart of every creature,
He is the meaning of each feature;
And his mind is the sky
Than all its hold more deep, more high.' P. 70.

All this is not very easy to understand; but enough is apparent to satisfy the reader of the nature of Mr. Emerson's religious or rather irreligious opinions. The book throughout professes the most far-spreading love, and sublimest philanthropy; but that these are on quite a different model from the Christian one, comes out plainly enough.

'Love's hearts are faithful but not fond,
Bound for the just, but not beyond;
Not glad as the low-loving herd,
Of self in other still preferred,
But they have heartily design'd
The benefit of broad mankind.
And they serve men austerely,
After their own genius clearly,

Without a false humility;
For this is love's nobility,
Not to scatter bread and gold,
Goods and raiment bought and sold,
But to hold fast his simple sense,
And speak the speech of innocence,
And with hand, and body, and blood,
To make his bosom counsel good:
For he that feeds men, serveth few,
He serves all, that dares be true.'

Again, the fir-tree in mystic speech advises its friends,

'Behind thee leave thy merchandise,
Thy churches and thy *charities*,
And leave thy peacock wit behind;
Enough for thee the primal mind
That flows in streams, that breathes in wind.'

Mr. Emerson is undoubtedly a man of ability, though he has overvalued and mistaken his powers, and bewildered himself in speculations which his mind has not strength for. Even the sphinx's extravagances, though we cannot make out the connexion of one in ten of her oracular sentences, makes true the old wit's saying, 'An eminent fool must be a fool of parts.' It is not every one who could write *such* a farrago. He would have been a poet had he not obscured his powers by the pursuit of vain imaginations; proudly brooding over mysteries which have already been solved for him, and searching in darkness for what the Day Star has risen to show him, till intellectual and moral perception are equally dimmed. Hence it is that, in spite of a highly-gifted nature, his friends have to defend nonsense, to palliate profaneness, to blush at his daring justification of evil. However, these are minor points in the estimation of modern freethinkers. Their confidence is not shaken in their prophet, even by the following admission:—

> 'We think that we can observe in many of Emerson's later essays, and in some of his poems, symptoms of deepening obscurity; the twilight of his thought seems rushing down into night. His utterances are becoming vaguer and more elaborately oracular. He is dealing in deliberate puzzles —through the breaks in the dark forest of his page you see his mind in full retreat toward some remoter Cimmerian gloom. That retreat we would arrest if we could, *for* we are afraid that those who will follow him thither will be few and far between.'

Surely the love of darkness rather than light was never so plainly written in words before. The reason for regret is *naïve* indeed. It is very true, a thick mist is falling on the unhappy philosopher; he gropes his way amid shadows; his genius lies under a nightmare; he strives for utterance and finds no words, while his disciples stand around catching his 'indistinct murmurs,' for so they call them, and esteeming them inspiration. They who reject that service which is perfect freedom, as intellectual bondage, are in the case of their own idols so servile as to esteem highest the thoughts they cannot penetrate, and, in their voluntary humility, to hold what they cannot comprehend, to be, therefore, above their comprehension. So we can suppose some of those hearers on Mars' Hill, lovers of new things; turning from an apostle's teaching to listen in obscure caves for the voice of the lying oracle. As an American, Mr. Emerson's poems must find a place here, but it is due to his countrymen to explain that our extracts in his praise have been penned by none of them. Rather it is the boast of this eulogist that Britain has the glory of first discerning his excellence, and rewarding it with honour. America is reproached in no very measured terms for its blindness and insensibility in regard to this great man. He is without due esteem in his own country: it has not proved itself worthy of his genius. Nor could we have supposed otherwise. Mr. Emerson, as we have said, has a different style from his countrymen; they are not likely to feel a charm in simple no-meaning sonorous words. And when their poets take up a profounder philosophy, they will at least require that they should understand it themselves.

With this testimony to our neighbours' good sense, we will bring our article to a somewhat abrupt conclusion; for which the length to which we have already run must be our apology.

ART. III.—1. *The Life of Jesus, critically examined: translated from the German of* DR. DAVID FREDERICK STRAUSS. 3 vols. London. 1846.

2. *Geschichte der letzten Systeme der Philosophie in Deutschland, von Kant bis Hegel: von* DR. C. L. MICHELET. 2 vols. Berlin. 1838.

3. *Observations on the attempted Application of Pantheistic Principles to the Theory and Historic Criticism of the Gospel: being the Christian Advocate's Publications for* 1840—1844: *by* W. H. MILL, D.D. &c. Cambridge. 1840—1844.

'THE Founder of the Absolute Idealism,' writes the historian of the latest systems of German philosophy, 'where Nature 'and the Individual (*Ich*) become sunk in common in an absolute identity, is G. F. W. Hegel, who has become the crown of 'the collected past, and no less the seed of a most blooming 'future; since he has laid the germ of an infinite development 'of philosophy.'[1] But, highly as this merit may be estimated at Berlin or Tübingen, his name might have remained unknown to many to whom it is now familiar, had not one of his disciples endeavoured 'to define more clearly the antithesis which he 'had established between the immediate representation of the 'dogma and its speculative contents, and to draw attention to 'the historical origin of the former.' Starting from his master's position, that 'since the facts of the Life of Jesus are to be 'apprehended by faith, the want introduced into the world's 'history necessarily required of the faithful, according to the 'tenor of Christianity, certain representations, without thereby 'enabling us to make out the least point of what had empirically happened,' the guiding principle in his theory of Christianity is, that 'whatever objections unrestrained criticism may have to make against the sensible fact, the 'psychological fact that such has been the belief, remains 'certain; and this also, according to Hegel, is the only point 'to be established, as well as the only matter of interest.'[2] On this principle he has constructed a 'Life of Jesus,' which, while it has called forth the animadversions of many of the better class of writers in the country in which it first appeared, has also led a learned theologian, holding one of our University offices which imposes the duty of answering 'any new or dangerous error, either of superstition or enthu-

---

[1] Michelet, Geschichte, ii. 601.

[2] Michelet, ii. 680.

'siasm, in opinion or practice,' to undertake its refutation. But, lest such a description of Strauss's work should fail to convey any distinct notion of it to those who are not familiar with the phraseology of his philosophy, we may venture to translate the processes of his reasoning into the humbler language which is current in this less enlightened country.

In every religion, it is assumed, a time will come when the ancient faith being found inconsistent with the higher culture and increased light of the age, it will become necessary to devise some means of reconciling them. That period is supposed to have been reached in regard to the Christian religion, through the high illumination which rejects the possibility of a Divine interference with the established course of nature; having arrived at the persuasion, that 'whatever happens in the 'external world, as well as in ourselves, *can* only happen under 'the relations of cause and effect which are firmly established in '*all* nature. . . Hence the contradiction between the new culture 'and the *historic* contents of the ancient holy writings will be 'more plainly expressed by saying, that the miraculous, imme'diate encroachment of the Divine upon the human (*e. g.* mira'culous cures by Divine power, &c.) loses its *verisimilitude.* 'Whatever contradicts the laws of nature, appears to us *impos'sible:* for instance, that a quadruped should have spoken.'[1]

To remove this contradiction, Strauss, following out the imperfect beginnings of Kant, Schleiermacher, and others, proposes to explain the whole gospel narrative in a mythical or allegorical manner,—content to acknowledge that *some* amount of historic fact may lie at the bottom of the story, but not venturing to fix on and explain any particular, and taking *the whole* not for true history, but for holy tradition.[2] To him, therefore, the actual existence of the Man Christ Jesus, whom Christians worship as the Incarnate Word, crucified for their redemption, and raised again for their justification, is a mere accident; and while they are wont to regard every event of His life as recorded for the support of their spiritual existence, the new philosophy is made perfect in withdrawing their attention from the personal Redeemer, and directing it to the Ideal, which is adumbrated in these apparently historic Myths. But in this process 'the supernatural Birth of Christ, His miracles, 'His resurrection and ascension, remain eternal Verities, *how'ever much their reality as historical Facts may be doubted.*'[3] The regeneration of the world by Christianity is not a moral and spiritual change, wrought by the introduction of a divine virtue, working upon the corrupted mass in a manner and degree never before vouchsafed, but is marked by the progress of civilization and the extension of science: the victory of the Christian is not gained in a war against sin and temptation, through self-discipline and devoted obedience to the revealed will of his reconciled God and Father, but in researches into the laws of the material world, in contest with the hidden powers of nature, which are made subservient to his convenience or luxury, as in the compass or the steam ship, (more real instances, as it is asserted, of man's power over matter than are afforded by the gospel miracles): it is the exaltation and triumph of intellect, not the sanctification of the spirit. And the faith and hope by which he is to be animated and sustained during the struggle of life is not trust in the favour and protection of the Eternal and Almighty Disposer of all things, nor the assurance of the ancient patriarch, that at the latter day he should in his flesh behold God; but the belief that the race to which he belongs is immortal and ever progressive in spite of the continual decay of its successive members, and that when his part has been played among his fellow-men, the finite will be absorbed into the infinite, the individual soul sunk and swallowed up in the all-pervading Spirit.

---

[1] Strauss und die Evangelien, p. 2: A translation of the Leben Jesu from scientific into popular language, for the benefit of the unlearned.

[2] Strauss und die Evangelien, p. 22. Der mythische Ausleger *gar* kein Factum herausdeuten *will.* Id. p. 33.

[3] *Strauss,* Leben Jesu, Vorrede, p. xii.

Such, in brief, is the system which Dr. Mill has deemed of sufficient importance to receive an elaborate refutation; and though, when thus exhibited, it may be thought too much opposed to English habits of thought to deserve such serious treatment, several reasons will presently appear to justify his course. In the mean time a review of the manner in which he has performed this task, will make our readers more familiar with the details of this strange and incoherent system.

The foundation of natural religion is, belief in one God, and that of revealed religion in its most perfect form, belief in one Christ; and the corruptions of the former being either polytheistic or pantheistic, those of the latter might by analogy be expected to issue either in a supposed series of Incarnations, or in an *exclusion of personal union* in the Incarnation; the Christ in the latter case being considered a *generic expression* of what is common to the Church. The earliest and latest corruptions of Christianity belong to this latter class, both making a claim to the possession of a superior science or Gnosis;[1] and though differing in almost all the details of their system, (most especially in the total denial by the later illumination of the existence of angels,) agreeing remarkably in two leading features; 1. In considering all spiritual intelligences to be portions thrown out from the Divine fulness; 2. in believing matter, as such, to be the source of all imperfection and degradation.[1]

---

[1] After mentioning how Hamann, a writer of the mystical school, had 'given 'an allegorical meaning to the five barley-loaves, without troubling himself about 'the fact,' Michelet adds, 'how much more may we, philosophers of a new *Gnosis!*' 'Wie viel mehr wir, Philosophen einer neuen Gnosis!' Geschichte, ii. 680.

Dr. Mill notices the ancient Gnostic theories ‘of emanating ‘Æons, in which the Life, and Light, the Church, and Man, ‘and Christ, are found grouped in a variety of ways, equally ‘strange and arbitrary,’—and showing that ‘in the minds of ‘these teachers and their admiring disciples, the descent of ‘the Son of God from the Father for the salvation of man was ‘less an object of simple reception as a sacred *fact*, than a *placitum* which they might handle as they thought fit; one which ‘“had its place not in history but in philosophy,” in the eternal ‘world of divine existence, of which each man's spirit was a ‘portion, — and which they might accordingly find reflected, ‘as in a mirror, in their own psychological contemplations ‘and fantastic reasonings.’[2] The case of the Manichean heretics of the middle ages, who rejected the miraculous history of the gospels, except in their own mythical interpretation, is also referred to as illustrative of the hold which idealities of this kind may have upon the minds of men in a state of mental cultivation very different from that which originated them. The pantheistic view of the Deity, revived in Europe in the 17th century by the publication of Spinoza's works, met with little favour; ‘but the philosophical writings of ‘Schelling and Hegel have since given its distinctive principles a complacent admission, and a currency which they ‘never before this age possessed in any part of Christendom. ‘The former went far beyond his predecessors, in teaching ‘an absolute indifference or identity between the subject and ‘the object, between the thought and the essence contemplated: ‘and the identity of man with God, which in this school of ‘“subjective idealism” was made a matter of intuition, the ‘latter professed to demonstrate, by a system of logical definition and analysis of our conceptions.’[3] His disciple, Strauss, has worked out on an historical ground the philosophical principles of his master, postponing authority and critical or historical argument to Hegelian metaphysics, which he regards as established truth. In this process we are told, 'not a hair 'of the Christian dogma is ruffled; but rather it is exalted from 'the form of the sensible appearance to the province of the 'general reality of the Divine Being . . . To comprehend a religion can never mean anything else than to extract the inmost 'kernel of thought out of the sensible husk. Strauss's great 'merit is to have drawn out this symbolical character more 'definitely in the Christian religion also.'[1]

---

[1] Mill, pt. i. pp. 15—17.

[2] Mill, pt. i. p. 18.

[3] Mill, pt. i. p. 22. Wird nämlich der Gedanke zum obersten Princip gemacht, so tritt entweder das objective Sein vor dem Gedanken zurück, und verschwindet selbst gänzlich, so dass nur die Subjectivität des Gedankens als das allein Seiende Stand hält—der subjective Idealismus Kant's und Fichte's: oder umgekehrt der Gedanke selbst wird zur Objectivität hinübergeführt, und alles Sein als vernünftiger Gedanke ausgesprochen,—der objective Idealismus Schelling's. Hegel endlich, welcher diese beiden philosophischen Ansichten vereinigt, und zugleich den Idealismus mit dem Realismus aufs Innigste verschmelzt, hat Philosophie bis zu

The plan which Dr. Mill has followed in the examination and refutation of this scheme has been, to ascertain the view of the Christian mystery, which the author intended his critical examination to subserve: then to examine the internal consistency of these principles and their alleged connexion with the criticism of the life of Jesus, and hence to form a previous idea of the Rationale of the mythicizing process: and, lastly, to consider it in its application to what part of the evangelic history which seems most favourable to it.

The spirit of the age, in Strauss's view, requires that religion should be taken off from the ground of *historical* faith, and in so doing he conceives he shall establish the identity of the Christian religion (which he acknowledges to be the most excellent of all) with the highest philosophic truth. But as all previously existing theories of Christianity have set up historic facts as the objects of faith, his first work must be to show the inadmissibility of these. And here, whether from real candour and appreciation of excellence, or from that confidence in his own superiority which often leads a theorist to extend his compassionate approbation to the belief and practice of a less advanced age, we find a full recognition of the Scripture ground of 'the Christology of 'the orthodox system,' an admission of the purifying and exalting conceptions which the Church derives from her view of Christ, even an acknowledgment that Scripture contains the initial forms of the Catholic creeds, and that the condemnation of the Ebionites, Arians, and other early heretics implies a consistent, well-defined system of doctrine, touching the personal and historic Christ. The objections to the system thus represented, resolve themselves almost entirely into an assertion of the impossibility of the union of the two Natures in one Person, *because* such union is inconceivable: and into the determination laid down by Hegel, that whereas Christ

---

dieser Höhe der Ausbildung geführt, wo ihr der Name des absoluten Idealismus beigelegt werden kann. Michelet, i. 34.

[1] Michelet, ii. 681.

[2] Mill, pt. ii. p. 26–31.

is represented as Prophet, Priest, and King, the Eternal *cannot* be thus connected with, and interfere in the world.[1] Next in order follows a similar review and rejection of the Rationalistic scheme, to which Strauss objects its open repugnance to Christian faith, while it puts in the background, and even banishes from its dogmatic system, the doctrine concerning Christ, which is the very centre and corner-stone of the latter. It fails in what is required of every system of belief,—in giving an adequate expression of faith, and in placing it in its due relation to science: the expression of faith is mutilated in the endeavour to bring it into harmony with science.[2] Nor does he show more favour to the scheme of Schleiermacher, who interprets the Incarnation to mean a purifying and perfecting virtue existing in Christ, and communicated from Him to His Church, and who sees in the Union of the two Natures nothing more than an archetypal character pervading every historical event in His life, the supernatural facts of which are believed historically only, not as associated with our interior experience: this scheme also is rejected by Strauss both on grounds of faith, because it omits from consideration the resurrection of Christ, and consequently sinks the true conception of His Death and Ascension, and on grounds of science, because on Schleiermacher's premises an ideal Christ would have served the same purpose, and an historic one was inconsistent with his view of the relation of God to the world, while the ideal of archetypal piety could not be realized without miracle in an historical individual.[3] Thus the field is left open to a later and more perfect philosophy, which promises us Divine realities instead of empty ideas, and the assurance of God's union with humanity instead of the mere prospect of man's attaining godlike sentiments; which, moreover, is to teach us (for this is the illumination of the age,) that nothing can be which is not already, and that the infinite is not something beyond the finite, but consists in the setting forth and reabsorption of the finite.

In this system (which Dr. Mill's Eastern learning recognises as identical in principle with the high Brahminical theology) we are taught that when God is spoken of as a Spirit, so far as man is spirit *there is no distinction or difference between them;* that as man in his finite capacities does not possess Truth, so God, in His pure Infinity and Spirituality, does not possess Actuality (*Wirklichkeit*); and that the infinite Spirit is only *actual* when He shuts Himself up in finite spirits, as the finite is only *true* when immersed in the depth of the Infinite. From this is deduced Strauss's view of the incarnation: that God and man are one, *religion* being the human side of the unity, *revelation* the divine; and man, by apprehending this unity, is delivered both from the deification of sense and corruption, and from the terrors of a legislating God; that this truth, which is the God-man, will, when mankind is ripe for it, be exhibited in a generally intelligible form, as an individual embodying both properties of truth and actuality: in which sense it may be said of him that he has a divine Father and a human mother: that viewed as reflected in the Divine substance, he is divinely sinless and perfect; as man of a divine essence having power over nature and working miracles, but as God in a human manifestation being dependent on nature, subject to its necessities and sufferings, even to death.

---

[1] Mill, pt. i. pp. 26—31.

[2] Mill, pt. i. pp. 31, 32.

[3] Mill, pt. i. pp. 33—36.

> 'The God-man Himself dies and shows thereby, that it is God with his assumed humanity in real earnest . . . If God thus found His way from heaven to the grave, so must also a way be found for man from the grave to heaven; the death of the Prince of Life is the life of the mortal. . . . Finding himself in a natural state, the faithful man must die like Christ to the natural—but inwardly only as He outwardly: he must suffer himself to be crucified and buried spiritually as Christ was bodily, in order that by the removal of the natural state he may be identical with Him as spirit, and be a sharer in Christ's blessedness and dominion.'[1]

Here, however, it is necessary to observe, as Dr. Mill has done, that although these statements of doctrine may resemble the belief of the Church in the Death and Resurrection of Christ, the apparent identity is even carefully disclaimed by Strauss himself. For him,

> 'The Divine Spirit in its exterior and condescending manifestation *is the Human;* the human, in its reflection into itself, is the divine: yet can he not therefore conceive how Divine and human nature should make up one historic person: the spirit of humanity in its union with the Divine evermore perfectly exerts itself as might over nature in the course of world-history, yet is this quite different from supposing an *individual man* armed with such power. The bodily resurrection of an individual will not follow from the truth that the removal of the natural state is the resurrection of the spirit.'[2]

And here the writer anticipates the objection that in his scheme, as in those of Kant and De Wette, *idealities* only are seen, and nothing is given for faith to rest upon, by distinguishing between the *future* idealities of dreaming transcendentalists, and the real, *present*, operative ideas of his own Gnosis. His boast is, that the idea of union of divine and human nature, is real in a higher sense when the *whole of humanity* is its subject, than when a particular man is so regarded. The incarnation of God from eternity is, in his view, a truer thing than one in an exclusive point of time; and the better knowledge of the age is contradicted by thinking more highly of the gospel miracles than of the incredibly increasing dominion of man over nature, the irresistible might of the Idea. The key to his Christology is 'an *idea*, instead of an *individual*, set forth as the subject of the attributes predicated of Christ by the Church,' but this idea a *real* one, not as with Kant *unactual;* and the properties and functions ascribed by the Church to Christ, which he finds inconsistent and self-contradictory when predicated of an individual God-man, harmonize in the *idea of the genus.*

---

[1] Mill, pt. i. p. 42—45.

[2] Mill, pt. i. p. 46.

> 'Humanity is the union of the two natures, the God made man, the Infinite Spirit thrown off into finiteness, the finite reminding itself of its infinity. It is the child of the visible mother and of the unseen father, of the spirit and of nature. It is the wonder-worker, inasmuch as in the course of the history of man, the spirit ever more perfectly masters nature, in man as well as without, and nature is subjected as the powerless material of his activity. It is the sinless, inasmuch as the course of its development is a blameless one; pollution ever remains in the individual only, but is taken away in the genus and its history. Humanity it is which dies, and rises, and ascends towards heaven, inasmuch as ever rising higher, spiritual life proceeds out of the negation of its natural condition; and its oneness with the infinite spirit of heaven proceeds from the removal of its finite state, as personal, national, mundane spirit. Through faith in this Christ, in his death and resurrection, is man justified before God, *i. e.* the individual man becomes partaker of the divino-human life of the genus through the quickening influence of the idea of humanity in itself, especially in the momentous circumstance that the negation of the natural and sensuous state (which itself is already the negation of the spirit), and consequently the negation of negation, is the only way to the true spiritual life for men.—This alone is the absolute subject-matter of Christology; the circumstance that this appears bound up in the person and history of an individual, belongs only to the historical form of the doctrine.' 'Thus in the outward fact our age will be conducted merely to the *idea* for its Christology; in the individual to the race at large.'[1]

The singular description of humanity as 'the child of the visible mother, Nature, and the invisible father, Spirit,' is one of the points in which Dr. Mill discovers a resemblance between the German and the Brahminic systems.

> 'The sentence is in both its parts thoroughly Indian. In the Sankhya or Catalogistic school of philosophy, the Eternal, Self-existent, and True, is termed PURUSHA, the male, and is expressly denied the property of activity (or what our author terms, *Wirklichkeit*, and opposes to *Wahrheit*), while the active principle, from whose fecundity all the rest of the twenty-four Æons in their catalogue proceed in order, is the female, called MULAPRACRITI, or Radical *Nature*. In the more highly spiritual school, which asserts against the former that all spirits or intelligences are but one, the Eternal,

---

[1] Mill, pt. i. pp. 50—52.

> the sole substance of them all, is termed either in the masculine ATMA, Spirit (*der Geist*), or in the neuter, BRAHMA, and is, as such, quiescent. When the universe is evolved from his substance, what combines with his creative power to produce the illusion of diversity from him, is the female MAYA, who is identified in the Puranas with PRACRITI, or Nature, and termed the great Mother of the world.' [1]

The questions which Dr. Mill proposes for the examination of this system, are—first, Whether it offers any tangible ground of faith, any object of belief which the common sentiment and testimony of mankind can acknowledge as intelligible? and second, Whether it is the substance of the doctrine contained in the gospels?

For as regards the former, the notion of personality must be altogether dropped; the believer's attention must be withdrawn from the historical, and fixed exclusively on the Idea; the deeds and words of Jesus are not even to be stored in his mind as the basis of that Idea.

> 'For, according to Hegel's teaching, faith, when it begins in a sensuous manner, has its temporal history before it; but it is otherwise when the spirit brings to his consciousness the idea of humanity one with God, and sees only in history the working of this idea. Then the object is entirely changed, becoming spiritual and divine, instead of sensible and empiric, and has its credentials, not in history, but in philosophy. The sensible history is abolished as an essential, and degraded to a distant dreamy vision, whose place is in the past, not in the ever-present Spirit.'

If, then, the office of the Spirit were indeed to commit to degradation and oblivion, instead of to 'bring to remembrance,' and properties which are said to be inconsistent and self-contradictory when applied to an individual God-man, cease to be so when predicated of the human race as such,

> 'What,' asks Dr. Mill[1], 'is the idea to which his faith is directed, the "ethereal sublimate," which, when gained, the historic "residuum" is to be rejected and trampled under foot? It is even this. A glorious human race exists, in which the pulse of divine life is ever beating, which is itself the truest efflux and manifestation of divinity; for ever thrown off from the Infinite, and returning into its depths again, as the cycle of finite existences perpetually renews itself; in which continual new victories of mind over matter, of art over nature, are adorning the regions of civil, and social, and scientific life; where daily improvements in arts and sciences, in politics, morals, and religion, are ever speeding the whole towards its faultless perfection; where, too, as the elevated soul battles with nature and corruption, yet preserves its identity throughout,—the double negation issuing in a splendid affirmation, when the nature which would quench the spirit is quenched and vanquished by it in turn—we behold a death, indeed, but a death attended with perpetual resurrection and ascension on high, to which the heart of man, that owns no other hope, clings with admiring faith and ardent aspiration. "Is it not so?" asks the hierophant of this new-termed

---

[1] Mill, pt. i. p. 50.

Christianity, when he has worked himself to a fervent enthusiasm in the contemplation: "Is not this he that lives and was dead, and behold he is alive for evermore—the everlasting, ever-improving—the ever young, fresh, and vigorous race of man?"'

In answer to all this, Dr. Mill appeals to the general sentiment of mankind, which confesses that, far from any strength or comfort being ministered by the thought that science and art are ever mastering nature to *their* purposes, while man, individually a victim, is collectively omnipotent, and the Idea ever triumphs at last; this consideration only awakens a painful sense of contradiction between man's faculties and his destiny, and creates a dissatisfaction only to be forgotten in sensuality or quieted by the teaching of a far better faith.[1]

The following passage is interesting as carrying on the extraordinary parallel between the German and the Indian philosophies:—

'Like Hegel, the Vedantists identify the spirit that is in man with the Spirit of the universe; like him they teach, that as by thought man ceases to be a votary of sense and matter, a mere child of "the visible mother Nature," whose illusions involve men in the disquieting and corrupting agitations of varied interests and passions, so by fixing his mind on that which is alone eternal and true, he breaks the illusion of the separate *ego* and *meum*, he becomes identified with the object of his thought and knowledge, the Spirit which is everlasting and unchangeable. The Indian theosophist agrees with our author and his school in considering this as the only true idea of man's immortality, all that is separate and individual being transitory and perishable; but here is the great difference. Instead of instructing man, as Strauss does, to find his immortality in that of the never ending species—to trace his own perfectibility and godlike being in the continued improvement of the race in knowledge and civilization, the Gentile sage teaches the highest spiritual votary a more excellent way than this, and far more accordant with the real philosophy of the system. The lower way does indeed suffice, in this heathen judgment, for such as take up with the world as it appears to the undiscerning eye, composed of many separate souls and varied concerns; virtuous conduct in these (unreal) relations, joined to worship of the Deity in the several forms in which, in accordance with this imperfect view, he is variously manifested in traditional religion and mythology, will insure its reward in this life, and in successive stages of subsequent being; but the reward is still transitory, as everything individual must be ...... But the soul that firmly believes and embraces this doctrine of identity with the Supreme, seeks the realization of its blessedness at once, *i. e.*, deliverance from this illusory round of varied being, and absorption into the Supreme essence. By meditation on the One Eternal and True, the vessel that now holds the soul as a separate individual is broken, and its ethereal fluid merged in the ocean of pure spirit. The surface of the mind within, that now, through the agitations of nature and passion, reflects a variety of images from the one great object presented to it, is to be reduced to that unruffled state in which it reflects but One; and then the image and the substance are identified.'[2]

Strange is it, indeed, that the German science and philosophy, so vaunted as 'having laid a more firm and immovable foundation for a new form of Christian life, not for itself only, but for all mankind,'[1] should be found to agree with the Brahminic not merely in particular features, such as its anti-historical character, but in the very doctrine on which the system rests, that the knowing and the known are identical; while the former is even inferior in the consistent following out of its peculiar principles, and in its perception of the desirableness of emancipation from the bondage of sin through spiritual union with the only Self-existent and True, and through mortification of the blinding and distracting passions of the corrupted nature. 'It is one 'part of this anti-historic tendency,' says Dr. Mill, 'that the 'human race is conceived and spoken of as if it were eternal, as 'well on the side of the past as of the future, in a manner 'which calls to mind the doctrine of the Indian and other Gentile schools respecting the ever recurring Yugas or cycles of 'human existence.' In a later work, Strauss has, however, receded still further from the historic account, maintaining that 'all organic beings are originally produced by the unorganic 'matter . . . . . It was principally the liquid element, but not 'such as it is now, but mixed with the vital germs which it has 'now separated from itself, which, under the influence of the 'milder temperature of the original time, has put forth from 'itself gradually, at first the germs of the lower organisms, 'then the higher, and lastly, after a longer preparation of mixtures and divisions, the germ also of the human organism.'[2] 'And we contend that the πρῶτον ψεῦδος of this and of all 'similar heathen systems—the source of all that is impious and 'absurd in them—is precisely that which it has in common with 'the Schellings and Hegels of our own time: I mean the doctrine, enunciated nearly in the same terms in Sanscrit as by 'them in German, that the knowing and the known are identical, that consequently to the perfect Gnostic all worship is 'merged in self-contemplation.'[3]

---

[1] Mill, pt. i. pp. 60—63.

[2] Mill, pt. i. pp. 65—67.

The question whether such a Christology can be connected with the actual life of Jesus, has given Dr. Mill the opportunity of showing more fully how the writers of this school, regarding *history* as merely *suggestive* of their doctrine, and to be discarded from view when that has been attained, are forced to employ the same method which they themselves condemn in the earlier rationalists as arbitrary and unscientific, of putting out of sight a portion of the document of faith. This boldly speculative character is remarkably exhibited in a passage, omitted in the later edition of the Leben Jesu, but, as Dr. Mill maintains, indispensable as the connecting link between the still retained destructive process on the life of Christ (which converts into *causes* what the Church recognises as *effects*), and the conclusion that humanity at large is the only real objective Christ.

---

[1] Bunsen, Verfassung der Kirche der Zukunft, p. 364.

[2] Die christliche Glaubenslehre in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung und im Kampfe mit der modernen Wissenschaft i. 681, 682.

[3] Mill, pt. i. pp. 68, 159.

'In a time of the deepest convulsion, of the greatest bodily and mental suffering, a pure individual, venerated as divinely sent (a presumption as Dr. Mill well remarks, not accounted for by this system, and the more incomprehensible in proportion to the success of the destructive process by which the grounds of it are removed), sinks into suffering and death, and soon afterwards the belief in his resurrection forms itself. In such a state of things the *tua res agitur* must occur to every one . . . . . As in His sufferings the external trouble which oppresses humanity was concentred, and the internal represented, so in His reanimation lay the consolation that in such sufferings the spirit does not lose but maintain itself, that in the negation of naturalness it does not deny, but in a higher manner affirm itself . . . . . The idea of humanity in its relation to divinity has passed unawares before the Church, while she, induced by the person and fate of Jesus, sketched the form of her Christ.'

Dr. Mill has, we think, rather exaggerated the absurdity of this supposition, when he asks, 'Who are the sufferers? by whom and wherefore did they suffer?' and answers that, as the Jewish nation, suffering at the hands of the Romans even to the destruction of their national polity, cannot be meant, it must be the apostolic Church; the very ground of whose sufferings was that profession of faith in Christ crucified, risen and ascended, which Strauss would persuade us was preceded and created by their sufferings. It is the time of the crucifixion which he represents generally as one of convulsion, of mental and bodily suffering, and religious impoverishment (*die bekannte religiöse Verarmung jener Zeit*); and so far as he could descend to historic details, he would probably picture to himself a few individuals—philosophers, as the times went—indulging in reveries on the misery of their age, and fancying that as it might be aptly figured by the recent crucifixion of Jesus, so the exaltation they desired would be no less aptly figured if they were to conceive of Him as restored again to life.

But the unreasonableness of the hypothesis shall be shown in Dr. Mill's own words:—

'To perceive it fully, it needs but to conceive who the first Christians were, and how related to the alleged fact of their Lord's revivification; their leaders certainly cognizant whether it were true or not, and all unspeakably interested in being assured respecting it; every hope of this world being crossed by their adherence to the crucified Lord, no less than every preceding hope from the expected Christ in those who were Jews, and every preceding notion of divine manifestation and favour in those who were Gentiles. If a man urges imposture in this case, he speaks what is indeed most *false*, but what is conceivable; we may join issue on this—we may meet and discuss his arguments. And so perhaps we might, if, instead of imposture, he came with any definite and intelligible hypothesis of delusion in twelve or more persons; but here is one who says—"The resurrection is a truth, but a logical truth only, viz. the denial of the sensuality which is the death of the spiritual life; it is this double negation mythicized which is the true substance of the doctrine of Christ rising again from the grave; the first Christians having worked themselves into the belief of this (bodily) resurrection, in order to console themselves under the persecutions they endured for affirming it.' And what is to be said to him? The self-destroying circle of the statement, if the pronoun denote the latter bodily resurrection—and the utter incoherence if the former or spiritual resurrection be intended—equally defy all attempt to encounter the case with argument; it is easier to believe almost any miracle than to understand and embrace this.'[1]

Very brief must be our notice of the new attempt at reconciliation by which Strauss endeavours to make the consideration of the historical person of Christ profitable to enlightened Christologists; how he traces the progress of religion from obscure unconsciousness of the distinction between the divine and human, through a developing dualization and imperfect endeavours to balance them, up to the perfect overcoming of the separation in self-conscious spiritual unity, a unity most perfectly attained in Christ, in whose self-consciousness the antithesis of divine and human which exists in every human conscience, was first dissolved. Here again the author's unconscious agreement with Eastern speculations is very remarkable:—

'We have,' says Dr. Mill, 'as applied to Jesus Christ, that view of religious development which is precisely the same as the Hindu sage, Patanjali, has scientifically laid down. The *restrained* thoughts of him who has attained this spiritual oneness, are as above the *variously directed* thoughts of an obedient worshipper of the gods, as these are above the *abject* thoughts of the votary of passion, or the *mad* thoughts of the wicked and malignant. The Yoga, or ascetic process, by which the first and highest state is ascended to, from the second of mere obedience, consists, according to the Hindu teacher, of five steps: faith, fortitude of endeavour, recollection, concentration of mind on one object, and lastly, transcendental knowledge, by which the objective and the subjective Spirit are perceived to be but one.'[2]

Such a representation of the history of our Lord is unanswerably shown by Dr. Mill to be irreconcileable with the sacred records, which inseparably exhibit as the *peculiar* attribute of Jesus, that He is the only-begotten Son, the one Mediator, by union with whom only can the faithful attain union with God, and in whom, with the highest perfection in act and suffering, the ideas of humanity and divinity are kept ever and to the last, separate and distinct from each other.

Nor can we notice as its importance deserves the opinion (not confined, it may be feared, to Strauss or to Germany), that the mere cultivation of the intellect and improved observation of nature will result in the substitution of a purer worship—an opinion which is abundantly refuted by Dr. Mill's appeal to the past religious history of the world, as well as to the present co-existence of an absurd mythology with high philosophical religious speculations among the Brahmins.

---

[1] Mill, pt. i. pp. 89, 90.

[2] Mill, pt. i. p. 94.

But we must make a longer extract from the very eloquent passage which follows the examination of Strauss's objections to the Catholic belief in angelic existences and miraculous interference with the order of nature, and which, while it forms a suitable link between the exposure of Hegelian principles and the trial of their application to the criticism of the New Testament, claims the patient and thoughtful consideration of all who are disposed to look on German philosophy and theology as the fountain which is to give life, vigour, and soundness to all who will have recourse to its streams.

> 'The maxim that "not an Individual, but the Idea," must be the object of attention in the Christology of an enlightened period, is not peculiar to the enormous infidelity now under review, or even to the principles, which in every German metaphysical school, from Kant downwards, appear to have directed the province of philosophical theology. It belongs in some degree to the spirit of the age generally, an age impatient to grasp and systematize everything; and it is found even within the pale of supernaturalist Christianity. While the sacred name of Chirst is, by many beside Strauss and his adherents, considered as barely symbolizing the idea of human improvement, it is by some taken exclusively as representing the idea of pure benevolence, by some, that of mental liberty, by others, that of impunity for sin to those who accept and acquiesce in this *one* leading fact of gratuitousness....When the historical particular is not denied, as by Strauss, it is at least bent at will to the previous conception, instead of being the basis and perpetual suggestor of its own proper and often complex idea: and thus we find that while in the central point of all, the Cross of Christ—its true Christian aspect, as the reconciling love of God to man, is missed by the first mentioned classes,—its ever concurrent representation by the same Spirit of truth, as the exemplar of human patience and humility, the effective source and principle of divine charity within us, the crucifixion of sin in our members, the essence of self-denial and self-sacrifice, and that as the only course in which the atonement is applied and secured in effect to the individual Christian,—this is passed over by the others, deposed from its declared place in the Christian scheme, or even stigmatized as a Socinian conception. Meanwhile, these classes, however conflicting mutually on other parts of Holy Scripture, agree constantly in one point, in overlooking or explaining away all that relates to the Church: in divesting of all external attributes, and thus reducing to a mere ideal abstraction, the one divinely appointed instrument through which Christ, the Image of the invisible Father, is declared by the Spirit to the world. For the purely objective manner in which the Church has ever exhibited her Christ to the faith of mankind, is offensive to idealists of every description: it interferes by a too prominent testimony with the authority, both of their idolized compactness of system, and of their partial mode of interpreting holy writ: and hence their small esteem of the Catholic truth embodied in the confessions of every age, in comparison with the particular time when, and the persons by whom, their Idea was first set forth in its all-absorbing supremacy to the world.

'From all modes of error, and from that portentous one in particular, not far from ourselves, with which it has been the business of these pages to contend, our recourse is to the grand *objective truth* once delivered to the saints, and, however obscured by human weakness, never without its testimony, its living exhibition of righteousness and power to mankind. This truth is what the Creeds of the earliest Church compendiously propound to us. This is authoritatively presented to us from the first by the Church, our mother, as the sum and substance of saving faith: and the argument of our adversary himself has shown sufficiently, that it is from this quarter alone, of attested universal truth, that the means of effectually resisting him must be derived.'[1]

After this consideration of the principles and general purpose of the author of the Leben Jesu, Dr. Mill proceeds to inquire with what success he has applied his criticism to the gospel narratives, how far the difficulties on which he has grounded his objections to an historical interpretation are capable of satisfactory solution, how far he has succeeded in establishing any presumption in favour of a mythical origin even in those parts of the history which might seem most obnoxious to the charge, because furthest removed in point of time from the composition of the sacred books. The first of these portions is the relation of the circumstances connected with the birth of S. John the Baptist, which Strauss, rejecting equally the supernatural and rationalist interpretations, regards as a Myth created by the application to S. John of similar circumstances related in more ancient myths, as those of Isaac, Samson, and Samuel, the *cento* being produced merely in compliance with a popular notion, that so extraordinary a person must have been granted to the world in an extraordinary way. This hypothesis is shown to be inconsistent with the historic character which the age in question undoubtedly bears, and which is impressed especially on the prefatory verses of S. Luke's Gospel, improbable when the simplicity and fidelity of the canonical gospels are contrasted with the fabulous details of the somewhat later apocryphal writings, and impossible, on account of the shortness of the period which the early composition of the gospels would leave for the creation of such a fabric from dogmatic mythus. The argument to prove that the canticles contained in the first chapters of S. Luke could only belong to the particular period which formed the boundary of the old and new covenants; and again, the refutation of Strauss's allegation that the book of Daniel belongs to the Maccabean age, and borrows its view of the celestial hierarchy from the Babylonian system of belief, are equally interesting and satisfactory in a logical point of view. We extract the former.

"But it is to the subject-matter of these hymns that I would principally direct attention, as constituting it no less than an impossibility that these should be the mythic creation of after times, merely reflected back on their supposed authors by the Judaico-Christian sentiments since developed. The internal character of these hymns, I repeat, forbids this: it precludes the supposition of the Evangelist himself, even in the early stage of Christian history which we confidently ascribe to him, bearing any share in their authorship, or doing more than record these effusions, which the traditions of the holy families concerned had most probably preserved with care. For, observe the strain of sentiment, purely Israelitic throughout, which the hope of the coming Christ, afforded either through the precursor or immediately, wakens in these highly favoured persons. It is the raising up the horn of salvation in the house of David which is gratefully commemorated, the approach of the expected King from his royal line, who should give security from all foes, agreeably to his ancient promise of the land to Abraham and his seed for evermore: a mercy, which though not surveyed, as by a carnal Jew it would be, on the mere side of plenty, or riches, or vengeance over oppressors, but principally, and indeed solely, as affording free scope for that fearless service of God which was the delight of all the faithful Israelites,—that in holiness and righteousness of life they might walk before God and His anointed King perpetually,—is yet in its frame-work and material essentially Judaical still. There is, indeed, a glimpse of the highest blessings, *the knowledge of salvation through the remission of sin*, when He of whom the child of Zacharias was the herald should be manifested to those who sat in darkness and the shadow of death. But this blessing, which the song of Simeon expands further to a light to lighten the Gentiles, as well as the peculiar glory of God's ancient people, and which the hymn of the blessed Virgin (like that of Hannah) connects especially with the disappointment of the proud expectants in Israel, and the exaltation of the lowly and meek, is spoken of in all as one yet to be revealed: the view yet afforded even in this far advanced period, is but a dawn or a day-spring, dimly, though sufficiently, guiding to the path of truth and peace. Nor does their reference to the particulars and the means of human redemption proceed beyond this species of anticipation: the hymns differ in no other respect from the ordinary tenour of the Psalms, and other ancient predictions of the same mercies, than in the announcement of their *time* as now at length close at hand; and the designation of the *instruments* of their approaching but yet unreached fulfilment, as now actually present. Could this have been the case if they were written in the times of Christianity? The Church, we know, ever uses these evangelical hymns, as she does the Psalms of David, in her daily offices,—and understands them as pointing with most express reference to the crucified and risen Lord: but the question is not how she understands them so written, but whether she could so have written them? They who saw in the Incarnate Godhead, vanquishing death by death, re-ascended to heaven, and dispensing all power from the right-hand of the Father, a reign more glorious and more secure than any earthly image whatever could adequately reach,—could they have failed to exhibit some *explicit* statement of this, bursting through the more sensible imagery with which it is encompassed, as we see continually in the visions of the Apocalypse? And those again in the early Church who still retained in view the ideas of the elder covenant,—who thought of David's throne as yet to be occupied by the Lord who was crucified, and the hopes of all the faithful both now and of old, as powerfully directed to this species of consummation,—could they have forborne some indication of the intended concealment of the coming reign in an intermediate period of humiliation and suffering,—instead of setting it forth, like these hymns, as arising directly and uninterruptedly from the manifestation of the Prince of Peace and His fore-runner? Either way, conceived as the work of a spiritualizing or of a Judaizing Christian, the origination of hymns of this strain, solely from the ideas of the subsequent time, is alike inconceivable. And as little will their structure consist with the supposition of a dramatic purpose in the shaper of the mythus, carefully ascribing to Zacharias and the rest such ideas only as suited their stage of religious development. We have many such specimens of religious fiction and assumption of the persons of ancient writers; but none in which the authors have not thought it essential to the prophetic character in those they would personate, to introduce much more than can possibly be found here, of the *explicit* notions of their own day. We may mark this tendency in the religious imaginings even of our own critically disposed age; and it is certainly not without example in those of earlier Christian antiquity. Let then the works be carefully examined which are the product either of pious imagination, or of presumptuous and unhallowed fiction, exerted on the personages of sacred story, and compared with the tenour of the canticles called *Benedictus*, *Magnificat* and *Nunc dimittis*: and this is the conviction we would maintain as the result of the comparison. Such a vision of coming power, and light, and majesty, as these hymns indicate,—a picture so vivid as to the blessedness of the approaching reign, so indistinct and void as to the means by which that blessedness was to be realized,—in which, while the view of faith is so concentred on the source of salvation then initially manifested, the whole detail of His acts, and the particulars of His redemption, continue closely wrapped up in the figure and symbol which represented them in the ancient dispensation,—such a vision could belong only to the particular position assigned to it, in the boundary of the old and new covenants. The projection of a vision like this from the point of view under the New Testament, is what cannot in sound reason, or just criticism, be maintained: with the possession of such explicit knowledge as even Christ's earthly life supplied,—but still more His death, and the events that followed,—such reserve, united to such imagined anticipation, were to an earnest mind unnatural, to a deceitful mind impossible.'[1]

---

[1] Mill, pt. i. pp. 144—148.

Far more difficult and important is the other portion of the evangelic history which our author is called to defend, embracing the genealogy and nativity of our Blessed Lord, where the same theory of mythical interpretation is put forward by Strauss, as the only escape from the real difficulties to which the brevity of the sacred records prevents our giving a complete and demonstratively correct solution. Doubtless, many persons, whose faith and reverence for Scripture have been really unshaken by these difficulties, have often felt the want of a solution: and if we differ from Dr. Mill in any point, it will not be so much in respect to the conclusions at which he has arrived, and by which the chief apparent discrepancy in the Evangelic narratives is removed, as in our estimate of the weight of evidence on which his suppositions rest, and of the degree of improbability in the solutions which he rejects. We may premise that the arguments (or more correctly, the assumptions) of Strauss are as follows: The genealogies, considered separately, bear evident marks of not being historical; but when compared together, their discrepancies furnish overwhelming proofs of their non-historic character: they are consequently myths, formed to connect the Messiah with David, through Joseph, his real father, (the framers holding the Ebionite doctrine of the mere humanity of our Lord): their rejection by the Ebionite contemporaries of Epiphanius was owing to the infusion into the system of a Gnostic or Essene spirit, from which the older Ebionites, who appear from internal evidence to have been the framers, were altogether free: and the miraculous conception, though announced in the first and third gospels, is not supported, but opposed by the rest of the sacred canon; the most decisive exegetical proofs of its unreality, however, being found in the very genealogies which these two gospels record.

---

[1] Mill, pt. ii. pp. 40—51.

We need not notice the minor objections of Strauss, which are fairly and learnedly met by his opponent, but proceed at once to the consideration of the great difficulty, the double genealogy ascribed by the Evangelists to Joseph, the reputed father of Jesus. The first difficulty, the double paternity of Salathiel, Dr. Mill proposes to solve by the supposition that the line of Solomon, previously reduced in numbers by the recorded extermination of several of its junior branches, (2 Kings x. 13, 14; 2 Chron. xxi. 1—4, &.) became virtually extinct in Jeconiah, the other survivors of the seed royal being disqualified (Daniel i. 3, comp. Is. xxxix. 7: Jerem. xli. 1—3.) for the succession; and that Salathiel, the son of Neri, and the heir of David, upon the failure of the royal line, was adopted by him, and consequently is reckoned as his son by S. Matthew. The two lines, diverging again from Zorobabel, the nephew or grandson of Salathiel, though called his son by Ezra and Haggai, as well as by the Evangelists, are again connected by the successive marriages of their representatives Matthan and Melchi with Estha, an heiress of the same tribe. Jacob and Levi are respectively the offspring of these marriages; and the childless widow of the former being married by his half-brother Levi, (in obedience to the Mosaic precept,) becomes the mother of a son who is reckoned legally to Jacob, and called after *his* father Matthat or Matthan. This Matthat, of S. Luke's line, is the father of Eli, and grandfather of Joseph, in whom both the lines terminate; two generations being here, as in some other places, omitted by S. Matthew.

Perhaps this explanation is in itself the most probable one: yet Dr. Mill might have dealt more gently with those who would take a different view. He considers the explanation by which one of these genealogies is applied to the blessed Virgin as a ‘forced interpretation,’ a ‘violent mode of dealing with ‘ordinary language;’ yet a writer so full of reverence for Scripture as Mr. Williams, could speak of it as not unreason‘able to suppose that S. Luke should give the extraction of ‘S. Mary. And S. Augustine,’ as he adds, ‘mentions it as an ‘opinion which he did not disapprove of, that Heli, recorded ‘by S. Luke, was the father-in-law of S. Joseph, and the father ‘of the blessed Virgin.’ (The Nativity). For though S. Luke, in tracing the line, ordinarily passes from the son to the natural father, there is one instance at least (from Zorobabel to Salathiel,) where he does not, and probably another between Jesse and Naasson: and it may well be doubted whether his view involves a harsher supposition than Dr. Mill himself is forced to apply to the ἐγέννησε of S. Matthew, in supposing that Jeconiah simply adopted Salathiel.[1] The real and insuperable objection to it (which determined Mr. Williams, as well as Dr. Mill to reject it,) is to be found, not so much in the words of the Evangelist, as in the consideration that if it had really represented the actual case ‘those in the earliest ages, by whom ‘the exegetical difficulty was strongly felt, must have had ‘some apprehension of a fact which thus summarily disposed of ‘the matter in question, and left nothing in the two Evangelists ‘to reconcile.’—(Mill.) As Mr. Williams has said, ‘the very ‘obviousness and reasonableness of this opinion renders it pro‘bable that it is not the true one;’ otherwise it would certainly have been the current one. The double marriage of Estha, connecting the two lines, rests on a tradition of such venerable antiquity, that, as it contains nothing intrinsically improbable, it cannot reasonably be doubted.

> ‘Julius Africanus, a Christian writer of Palestine, early in the third century, speaks of certain persons residing in the villages of Nazareth and Cochaba, who from their kindred to our Lord were called Desposyni, from whose statements, said to be founded on private memoranda of genealogies, of which the originals had been destroyed by Herod, he gives the following account. Matthan, of Solomon's house, was the first husband of Estha,

---

[1] The word ערירי in Jer. xxii. 30—on which passage Dr. Mill grounds the necessity of this interpretation—occurs in only three other places; in the first clearly meaning ἄτεκνος and so rendered in all the three; but in this verse of Jeremiah, understood by the Greek interpreters and by S. Jerome in a lower sense, ἐκκήρυκτος: a sense which the latter part of the verse seems to favour. And since in the fourteen descents given in 1 Chron. iii. 10—14, the suffix pronoun of the word בנו invariably refers to the name which immediately precedes, it is probable that vers. 16 & seq. ought to be translated, ‘And the sons of Jehoiakim; Jeconiah ‘his son, Sedekiah his son,’ i.e. of Jeconiah, who was not eight but eighteen years of age at the time of the captivity; 2 Kings xxiv. 8, comp. verse 15; ‘and the ‘sons of Jeconiah the captive, (whom ἐγέννησε μετὰ τὴν μετοικεσίαν) Salathiel ‘his son,’ &c. Tertullian seems to have thought that the genealogy given by S. Matthew is that of the Blessed Virgin. De Carne Christi, c. 22.

and Melchi, of Nathan's house, the second; the issues of these marriages were respectively Jacob and Heli: the latter dying childless, his half-brother Jacob begat Joseph of Heli's widow. Joseph was therefore reckoned naturally as in S. Matthew's gospel, but legally as in S. Luke's.'

It will be seen that this explanation omits two of the names given by S. Luke, making Heli the son instead of the great-grandson of Melchi: Dr. Mill's emendation supposes the substitution of Heli for Levi to have been made by Africanus, (who erroneously referred the account he heard to Joseph instead of to his grandfather,) and produces a substantial agreement between the genealogies of the sacred historians and the statement of this very ancient writer. The explanation (corroborated as it is in the main by the suffrage of other early writers, as Origen, Eusebius, Gregory of Nyssa and of Nazianzum, S. Augustine,) seems in the highest degree probable, and removes the difficulty on the point of chief interest; but the tradition handed down by these ancient authors, that the two lines are made to converge by the successive marriages of uterine brothers, leads to an examination at some length of the Mosaic law touching the marriage of a childless widow, which Selden and the Rabbins consider to be not binding on such relations. Dr. Mill, on the contrary, maintains that uterine brothers were strictly bound, that where there were no brothers the obligation descended to those next of kin, and even sees in the case of Judah and Tamar an intimation that the father of the deceased husband might himself acknowledge the obligation. The history of Boaz and Ruth is that from which his chief arguments are drawn, and he quotes with approbation the opinion of Michaelis, who from this case extends the levirate law to 'pretty remote kinsmen,' and says that Boaz did not know that he was any relation, until *apprised of it by her mother-in-law.* (This does not appear in the history, and seems at variance with Ruth ii. 6, compared with ver. 19, 20.) He considers that Naomi's address to her daughters-in-law (Ruth i. 11—13.) can only be understood by supposing uterine brothers strictly bound by the law; the narrative of the marriage of Boaz—no very near relation of Mahlon—with the widow Ruth, 'to raise up the name of the deceased upon his inheritance,' with its accompanying circumstances, is appealed to as referring to the law in Deut. xxv. as well as to the antecedent usage; and he finds a confirmation of this supposition in the answer of the Bethlehemites, making mention of Tamar the widow of Er, from whose offspring by Judah Boaz himself was descended.[1] And this appears to us the least satisfactory part of Dr. Mill's argument; for if the law in Deut. xxv. was binding upon more remote kinsmen, to what purpose does Naomi, when returning to her husband's city and *kindred*, endeavour to dissuade her daughters-in-law from accompanying her, by the question, 'are there yet sons in my womb?'[1] Moreover, the drawing off of the shoe in Ruth iv. 7, is mentioned without any reference to the law of Deut. xxv. 5—10, as a custom of ancient date על־הגאלה ועל־התמורה: where as to the former word the kinsman is willing to avail himself of his privilege (אנכי אגאל) without any expectation of being thereby involved in a marriage with the widow of the deceased proprietor, while the latter word תמורה is still more general, being applicable to any change. The custom would appear, therefore, to have been followed in ordinary transfers of property, as in the times of our own early history the donation of land was made by the giving of a glove, or similar article,—an outward sign by which the bargain was clenched, and fixed in the memory of the witnesses. And certainly the reference of the Bethlehemites to the birth of Phares is explicable in their congratulation of one who derived his descent from the great patriarch, 'whom his brethren should praise' through the same Phares, without supposing the connexion of Judah with Tamar to have been such an one as the divine law would under any circumstances have sanctioned.[2]

---

[1] Mill, pt. ii. pp. 193—200.

The practice appears from the case of Tamar to have been far older than the giving of the law; to have been made compulsory by the law on the brother of the deceased only, (extended to the half-brother in the time of Ruth, if not so originally intended,) the union under such circumstances being exempted from the stain of incest which would otherwise have attached to it; while the conduct of Boaz throughout appears to have been dictated by a feeling of kindness and compassion, and respect for an ancient custom, rather than to have resulted from the strict and peremptory obligation of the law. Perhaps the only satisfactory explanation of the conversation between Boaz and the nearer kinsman is by the supposition that, in default of children, the daughter-in-law had some claims on the property of her deceased father-in-law,—as by the old Roman law she was in some cases considered to have (nurus . . . nam et hæc neptis loco est . . . ita demum erit sua hæres, &c. *Mosaic. et Roman. Legum collatio, tit. xvi. in Crit. Sac. tom. ii.*)—and consequently was bound, like other heiresses, to marry, if at all, within the tribe to which the inheritance belonged.[1]

---

[1] It may be observed that Turner, to whom Dr. Mill refers for a good refutation of Selden's Talmudism, agrees with Selden and the Rabbins in supposing the law of levirate to apply only to brothers-german, and kindred of the father's side; and even considers that the marriage of the widow with the uterine brother of her deceased husband, would under no circumstances be lawful. *Boaz and Ruth*, pp. 152, 160. The same writer sees in the drawing off of the shoe (Ruth iv. 8,) not the ceremony described in Deut. xxv. but one—of which we have no intimation except in this place—by which the kinsman was to acknowledge the right of the widow, Boaz drawing off his own shoe, and delivering it 'to his neighbour, i.e. to Ruth herself.' *Boaz and Ruth*, pp. 164—166.

[2] The exclamation of Judah, Gen. xxxviii. 8—11, from which Dr. Mill infers that 'even a father might acknowledge it as a righteous obligation on himself,' pt. ii. p. 195, need signify no more than an acknowledgment of his own error in not giving her in marriage to Shelah: the other supposition seems as inconsistent with the conclusion of verse 26, as it is repugnant to natural feeling.

But fully admitting the satisfactory nature of the evidence, which states that the lines diverging from David were again united by a marriage of this sort, either in the person of Joseph himself, or of his grandfather, Matthan, the questions arise, why is the genealogy of the affianced husband alone given, and not that of the Virgin-Mother? and how can we now establish the Davidic descent of our Lord himself?

> 'It is, indeed, less from any deduction of the Virgin's understood genealogy from that of Joseph, than from other independent proofs, that we are enabled to assert with confidence her descent from David. Such is the angelic address, Luke i. 32—35, saying that the holy offspring of her womb, engendered by the Holy Spirit, without human paternity, should inherit the throne of David, his father, over the house of Jacob; and such is also the manner in which she is mentioned in the next chapter as enrolling herself with her husband in the Davidic census at Bethlehem.'[2]

And as to the genealogy of Joseph—

> 'The Evangelist simply meant to give the Bethlehemitic genealogy of our Lord, as He was enrolled in the census of the preceding chapter—adding nothing to the genealogy thus recorded, but the continuance of its ascending line, as found by the Evangelist in the Old Testament, to the first fathers of Israel, and thence to the ancestors of mankind. By this supposition . . . all perplexity is done away as far as S. Luke's purpose is concerned . . . for the genealogical records could not, according to Jewish usage, exhibit the children, even of an heiress, otherwise than through their father.

---

[1] Inference from subsequent practice must be received with considerable caution in explanation of the original intention of a law, otherwise very erroneous conclusions may be arrived at; see e.g. 2 Sam. xiii. 13, or 1 Chron. ii. 34, 35. Turner's conclusion that the levirate law gave no permission to uterine brothers to marry the widow of the deceased, and, consequently, that such marriages still continued to be unlawful, is deduced from his belief that the law had reference simply to succession to the inheritance—a matter in which half-brothers by the mother's side were not concerned, but only relations on the father's side. He certainly fails in his attempt to reconcile this conclusion with Naomi's address to her daughters-in-law.

[2] The words '*ἀπογράψασθαι σὺν Μαριὰμ τῇ μεμνηστευμένῃ αὐτοῦ γυναικὶ*, distinctly indicate that Mary accompanied Joseph for the purpose of being enrolled herself, which she would not have been at Bethlehem, unless herself of the tribe of Judah, and of the race of Salmon, his sixth descendant, i.e. of the family (if not directly descended,) of David the king.' Mill, pt. ii. p. 206.

Our difficulty, therefore, in this case, is not one which concerns the human recorders of our Lord's genealogy; it relates to the *divine* dispensation exclusively, and may be comprised in the two following questions;—1. Why it should have seemed good to the Divine Providence to have caused Christ's first record among the Jews, as sprung from the race and lineage of David, to have been thus in the character of the son of Joseph? 2. And why it should have pleased the Holy Spirit, in directing the chosen historiographers of our Lord, for the benefit of all ages of the Church, to suggest no express genealogy besides this, leaving them to describe severally the natural and the adoptional lines of this, and withholding the descent of the only true parent? Now if the former of these two points is one of which orthodox Christians do not ordinarily permit themselves to doubt the wisdom, whatever may be their insight into its reasons, should not the latter point, however inscrutable its grounds may appear, be admitted in like manner without question? Nor can *necessity* be pleaded for information in the latter case, with nearly so much apparent reason as in the former; seeing that the one immaculate Child-bearing, which has removed the curse of Eve from humanity, applying to all generations of mankind alike, makes the knowledge of particulars as to our Lord's descent after the flesh a matter of less moment to us than to our Lord's immediate countrymen, seeing that to us the Virgin-born is proclaimed as re-ascended into heaven, and believed on among the Gentiles: while our historical faith is sufficiently provided for by the clear terms of the Divine annunciation to S. Mary, and the many other explicit assurances of the Lord's real carnal descent from David."[1]

This certainly is a representation which cannot be gainsayed when once it is admitted that both the genealogies really exhibit the descent of S. Joseph; and though an argument might be drawn from the obviously practical character of the New Testament narratives in general, against a mere hypothesis that the passages in question have so remote a bearing upon the extraction of our Lord, the requirements of such a supposed analogy cannot be maintained against positive evidence. Moreover Dr. Mill suggests, the concealment of the mystery of the miraculous birth may have been designed to preclude irreverent curiosity, and calumnious falsehood; the latter of which burst forth with virulence when that mystery became notorious as Christian doctrine, and not before; the Almighty being pleased, through the discretion of the blessed mother and her guardian-spouse, to keep close the secret till the time arrived when alone it could be generally appreciated or understood. Nor is it an unimportant remark in this connexion, 'that the 'same records which most circumstantially narrate this super-'natural conception and birth, acquaint us also most distinctly 'with this reserve in its communication,'[2] obviating thereby any objection which might have been raised against the reality of the mystery, from the early popular view of our Lord as the carpenter's son of Nazareth.

---

[1] Mill, pt. ii. pp. 209—212.

[2] Mill, pt. ii. p. 215.

From the genealogies recorded by the Evangelists in connexion with the Nativity, we are naturally led to consider what was the real relation to our Lord of those who are called in the New Testament, 'His brethren.' Strauss is not content to interpret the passages in which this expression occurs in an Helvidian sense, (an interpretation which, it may be noticed, his opponent Neander adopts on the ground that it is a very forced explanation to make ἀδέλφοι, in all these passages, equivalent to ἀνεψιοι, especially as the ἕως of S. Matthew, i. 25, is joined to the appellation of *first*-born,) but supposes he can trace the development of a Mythus from an original Ebionite view through intervening stages of opinion down to the statement of S. Jerome, that 'not only Mary, but Joseph, had ever preserved the virginal character,' and according to which 'the asserted brethren of Jesus are now no longer brethren, but cousins.' On the contrary, Dr. Mill, from a careful comparison of the passages in which these persons (James, Joses, Simon, and Judas) are mentioned by name or otherwise, determines that the former two were sons, not of the Blessed Virgin, but of her sister of the same name, (comp. Mark xv. 40 with John xix. 25,) the wife of Cleopas or Clopas, which he also supposes to be the same name as Alphæus, differently represented in Greek; while the other two, Simon and Jude, may possibly have been sons of Clopas by a former wife, the two families perhaps also forming a single household after the death either of Clopas or of Joseph. He considers it incredible that the Blessed Virgin should have been entrusted by our Lord at His crucifixion to the care of S. John, if S. James and S. Jude had really been her sons; and supposes, in accordance with the majority of ancient ecclesiastical writers, that two persons only of the name of James are spoken of in the New Testament, the son of Zebedee, and he who is variously termed 'James the Less,' 'James the Lord's brother,' or 'James the son of Alphæus,' who, as the first Bishop of Jerusalem, presided over the Council of the Apostles, and is known in ecclesiastical history as S. James the Just. In opposition to Strauss's assertion of the development of the belief on this point, he contends that none of the supposed intermediate stages of opinion (excepting a tradition, resting on apocryphal authority, that Joseph at the time of his marriage with the Virgin was a decrepid old man, given to her rather as a guardian than as a husband) was really evolved out of the preceding one: that, on the contrary, Strauss's supposed primitive doctrine was the belief of the blaspheming Jews, not of Christians, save of one anti-apostolic and ever-denounced party; while the belief of the Evangelists and Apostles, and of all Christians from the beginning, has been that Mary and Joseph were indeed affianced, but that Jesus 'was made very man by the operation of the Holy Ghost,' as without spot of sin, so without human paternity; the acknowledgment of the perpetual virginity of S. Mary not being the later deduction from this belief, but having co-existed with it from the first in thoughtful and reverent minds. But while denying that this latter opinion was formed upon mere subjective grounds, and maintaining that the Scriptures themselves furnish the real and sufficient arguments for referring 'the brethren of the Lord' to another parentage than the Helvidians would assign, Dr. Mill does not overlook the connexion between the Gospel mystery of the Immaculate Conception, and the natural disposition to embrace the view which Strauss would attribute to S. Jerome as its first inventor:—

> 'We will not deny what the experience of eighteen centuries of Christianity proves sufficiently as a matter of fact, viz. the tendency of the Christian mystery, God manifest in the flesh, when heartily received, to generate an unwillingness to believe that the womb, thus divinely honoured, should have given birth to other merely human progeny. Admitting, therefore, this fact . . . . it might then appear to follow that we ought to *allow* in our speculation for the effect of such tendencies and prepossessions, while weighing the testimony of the primitive and other believers, and therefore to make a presumption in favour of the side which is not thus favoured. But reasonable as this must appear, if we viewed Christianity as *ab extra*, it is utterly impossible that this can be considered as a just and philosophical proceeding, where the Incarnation is truly believed as an objective reality. The sole question must then be this—whether these sentiments or predispositions are of a nature essentially accordant with that stupendous fact,—or an extraneous product which human infirmity or misapprehension has associated with it? The sentiments in question require no less truly in the former case to be cherished as guides to the perception of actual truth on this divine matter, than they require in the latter to be utterly mortified and forsworn . . . . . If for the latter side we have the presumption arising from human frailty and ignorance, and their experienced power in corrupting or perverting the divine truths presented to them,—we have, on the other side, the presumption springing from something more than considerations of merely human probability, that what has been bound up with the conception of the Gospel mystery, wherever it has told most effectually and vitally on the world, cannot be radically corrupt or wrong.'[1]

From reflections like these there is an easy transition to the general question which lies at the bottom of them, the true view and relation of virginity and marriage. There is nothing perhaps in the system of thought and practice of the ancient Church which has been looked upon with so much jealousy and aversion as its monastic institutions, and the opinions of its most eminent teachers on the dignity of celibacy. Here, more than in anything, it appears to have been forgotten that, however excellent the rules of a society, or the object of its institution, offences must needs come, if only there be human imperfection in its members; and with a wilful neglect of the same root of evil springing up continually before our own eyes, the rare and promptly punished excesses of the purest times have been seized upon as evidence of a peculiar profligacy, and traced to the acknowledged teaching which was then current. Doubtless, as every station and period of life has its peculiar trials, so every religious opinion or practice (even when not carried to a blameable excess) may offer to the great enemy a peculiar point of attack, and when assailed on these points many will be found to fail: of this, it is the duty of the spiritual guide to warn those to whom he recommends such practices, or communicates such opinions: but then it must not be forgotten that such temptations accompany those assistances of the Christian life on the necessity of which there is no controvery, such as the practice of charity, or the habit of prayer, no less than those of which the ancient Church is supposed to have formed too high an estimate, such as the virgin life or the practice of mortification. And, further, though a single life has its own temptations as well as its own advantages, a married life is not therefore free from its peculiar dangers; relaxed rules of living, as well as strict ones, expose those who are under them to trials: and all that can be arrived at, in any case, is a balancing of advantages and temptations. With this caution, let it be fairly considered whether sentiments like those of the following passage can be charged with a dangerous tendency or with exaggeration of the truth:—

---

[1] Mill, pt. ii. pp. 301—304.

> 'It would open too wide a field of speculation were we to discuss the ideas of the earliest Church respecting virginity as they bear upon this question, and to prove—what is, I think, capable of the clearest proof—that these ideas in the substance of them, however they may have been tarnished by occasional excesses or errors, are but the carrying out of principles laid down and exemplified with repeated distinctness in holy Scripture. However strange it may seem to many minds at present to reconcile a high sense of the blessing and sanctity of marriage with an ascription of higher virtue to those who renounced its solaces for the sake of a closer devotion to the concerns of God's kingdom among men, the much-censured ancient Church did combine these two scriptural principles together: the same persons who attached such distinguished praise to purely religious celibacy, "the eunuchs, who so made themselves for the kingdom of heaven's sake," were most zealous in refuting and denouncing those whose precepts of abstinence were dictated by other views of religion; who, on the principles of either Gnostic or Manichæan heresy, vilified the divine work in the constitution of humanity, and decried wedlock as a work of the devil, or of an inferior Demiurgus. While not only was marriage hallowed in the minds of Catholic Christians by its divine institution anterior to human sin, and its continued exemplification in the holy patriarchs of the preparatory dispensation, but received its highest honour in the last by being made a divine mystery, a sacramental representation of that union of the Incarnate Lord with His Church, from which springs the spiritual progeny of the redeemed—can we deem this honour neutralized by their vivid sense of the pollution which since the fall attached to all merely human conception, and the consequent

impossibility that the Divine Restorer of humanity should be the offspring of conjugal union, but of a Virgin womb only? If not, how then can that just honour be said to be neutralized by their peculiar respect to that Vessel of the Divine Incarnation, and the sense of degradation they instinctively attached to the idea of that Virgin becoming subsequently a mother in the ordinary processes of humanity? Might we not rather suspect that professed honour of holy matrimony which nothing could content beside this? When we consider how contemporaneous in origin and growth with this praise of virginity in the Catholic Church have been those high ideas of the sanctity and inviolability of the nuptial union, which penetrated by degrees the corruption of heathen society, and introduced the domestic life of Christians in its place, we may well question whether the true source of that purity and happiness, and of the unbending strictness in which, as their essential condition, that purity and happiness are involved, is so well understood by the vituperators of ancient Christianity as they imagine.'[1]

The remaining portion of Dr. Mill's work is designed to vindicate the narrative of our Lord's Birth and the circumstances connected with it, as contained in the Gospels of S. Matthew and S. Luke; but though the part relating to S. Matthew was published three years ago, we still have to look in vain for the promised completion.

The coming of the Magi, the conduct of Herod, the flight into Egypt, and the massacre of the infants at Bethlehem, are all claimed by Strauss as indicating the same origin in the imagination of the early Christians, and requiring the same mythical solution, as the miraculous portions of the history in general. But if there be some similarity between the removal of the Infant Saviour from the power of Herod, and the escape of Cyrus from Astyages, of Moses from Pharaoh, and the like, in which Strauss finds the origin of his mythus, it is obvious, as Dr. Mill remarks, that the mere repetition of cases with similar circumstances is no evidence of falsity or invention, and that a fabulous narration of this sort, in which real characters were introduced, could not possibly bear a comparison with actual history. A sketch of the character and history of Herod furnishes ample proof that there is no *antecedent* incredibility in S. Matthew's narrative of the massacre at Bethlehem; and while Josephus is the only writer who has treated so circumstantially of Herod and Jewish affairs as to make his silence on this event in any way remarkable, the objection which this silence might suggest is obviated by the similarity of his conduct on a point of far greater prominence and importance—the origin and progress of Christianity, of which he has carefully suppressed the details. But several reasons are given for applying the jest of Augustus—'Cum audisset inter pueros quos in Syriâ Herodes rex Judæorum intra bimatum jussit interfici, filium quoque ejus occisum, ait: Melius est Herodis porcum esse quam filium,' *Macrob.* ii. 4—to this event, and so drawing from a heathen writer that confirmation of the Evangelist, which the Jewish historian does not supply, but which opponents of Christianity have considered so essential. For though it be true that no son of Herod perished among the infants of Bethlehem, and so far there may have been error in the report which reached the Emperor, yet the mention of the time 'intra bimatum' is a remarkable coincidence with the evangelic narrative; and the act of cruelty, as represented by the sacred writer, seems far more likely to have elicited the imperial pleasantry than the execution of the sons of Mariamne two years before, which, though monstrous and unjust, was pursuant to the sentence of Roman assessors, and had received the concurrence of Augustus, or the death of Antipater, which was likewise in virtue of a judicial condemnation, ratified by the Emperor himself.[1]

---

[1] Mill, pt. ii. pp. 312—314.

But the most interesting and valuable portion of this disquisition—because bearing on difficulties which are most generally felt—is that which relates to the prophecies cited by S. Matthew, and denied by Strauss to refer to anything beyond their immediate occasion. Such is the prophecy of Micah, v. 2, which the Rationalist and the later Rabbinic interpreters agree in explaining of the expected Ruler's *descent from David,* who was of Bethlehem, and not of His birth in that city, although in the days of the prophet the ancient city retained its original humble character, and could be exalted from it, not by a succession of kings of the line of David, but only by the birth within its limits of the promised Descendant greater than David himself: and such also the prophecy of Jeremiah xxxi. 16—26, referring in the first instance to the captive Jews collected at Ramah by their Chaldee conquerors, but pointing also to a restoration not fully realized on their return from Babylon, and foretelling a covenant of a more spiritual nature than the Mosaic, to be established by Him whose birth, after a new and mysterious manner, is described in the same prophecy (ver. 22.):—

> 'And as the coming of the Great Deliverer is the principal end to which all prophecy is directed. . . . we hold that the afflictions which more immediately preceded Christ's mediation and its results, those especially by which His first manifestation to mankind was signalized, lay entirely within the scope of the Divine Spirit in inditing these consolations. Rachel was not more stirred from her grave near Bethlehem Ephrata by the tearing of her children from their natal soil in the distant days of Jeremiah, than by the calamity which, at an age not much more distant, filled with sharper anguish all the mothers of Benjamin and of Judah in the immediate neighbourhood

---

[1] Mill, pt. ii. pp. 332—359.

of her tomb: and the comfort for the earlier sorrow which, as representing the mother of Israel, she receives from the prophet, in the assurance that her children, now lost, should return to her bosom, (a promise *personally* fulfilled but to few, if any, of those exiles,) is applicable in a higher sense to the representative mother with respect to children taken out of this world by tyrannic power, but for whom a redemption from death and the grave, a return from worse chains than those of Babylon, had been purchased by the Saviour on whose account they died.'[1]

A greater difficulty presents itself in the citation of Hosea xi. 2, 'Out of Egypt have I called My Son;' of which S. Matthew records the fulfilment to have been attained through the angelic command to the husband of S. Mary, to seek a refuge in Egypt for his charge. Dr. Mill argues that the adoption of Israel as the Son of God has, in the promise to Abraham, as we learn from the Apostle, a special reference to the One Seed, i. e. Christ; and that the Exodus from Egypt is the occasion of the first authoritative designation of the nation in this character of the 'First-born of God.' (Exod. iv. 22.) But in the departure of the people of Israel from the land of Egypt through the Red Sea, we have also apostolic authority for recognising a figure of the Church of Christ, under its Head, passing from the world of sin and death to the heavenly land of promise—a passage which is only attained by the members of the Body in virtue of the previous exaltation of the Incarnate Son. And as Israel went into Egypt—a single family—to preserve life when the famine was in the land, and came forth again after the lapse of years to be a distinct nation under the special protection of God, and with the office of specially witnessing for Him, it ought not to cause surprise when we find a further fulfilment of the text of Hosea indicated to us in the literal removal of the Infant Saviour from the dominions of Herod to the land of Egypt, whence, in due time, He came forth to resume in Israel His nurture under its peculiar law. The prophecy, moreover, is not cited, as infidels have insinuated, to heathens ignorant of the ancient Scriptures, but to Hebrew Christians well versed in them, who would derive an actual confirmation of their faith from observing the manner in which the Messiah answered to the type of God's first-born Israel of old,—the principle of combining Israel and the Christ being not restricted to the actual Gospel, but pervading the ancient Scriptures, and recognised even in the Rabbinic schools, till the support which it gave to Christianity caused it to be obnoxious there.[2]

The last of these citations is that in which our Lord's dwelling at Nazareth is represented as fulfilling an ancient prophecy that 'He shall be called a Nazarene;' a statement which, not being found in terms in any of the prophetic books, has been referred by S. Chrysostome and others to a lost book of the Old Testament. Dr. Mill admits that such an explanation cannot be proved *à priori* impossible or unworthy of the Almighty, (a line of argument, indeed, which Bishop Butler has sufficiently shown to be untenable,) but rejects it on the ground of the improbability of such a loss—at least since the return from Babylon,—and the strong evidence we have that the Old Testament canon is the same now as in the days of S. Matthew. He infers from the use of the plural number, '*the prophets*,' not '*the prophet*,' that we should regard it as the sense of several passages, rather than as a reference to any single text, and supports this view by the concurrent opinion of the early Hebrew Christians, who considered it to be gathered from those passages in Isaiah, Jeremiah, Zechariah, and the Psalms, especially Isaiah xi. 1, in which 'the Branch' is used as a title of the foretold Messiah. From this word *Netzer* (נצר) the name of the town Nazareth (נצרת) is formed, which these ancient believers regarded with reverent interest as the dwelling-place of the 'Flos Galilææ,' the (נצר) or fruitful Branch of the root of Jesse—an interpretation which has received the support of many modern as well as ancient commentators; and the town having been providentially so named, when at length the title of the Nazarene was given to our Lord, a prophetic title was unwittingly conferred upon Him. For it is plain that when Christ is called a Nazarene it is with reference to the place of His dwelling and supposed birth; and to suppose that this merely caused the fulfilment of prophecies expressed not in words, but in the lives of those—supposed types of Him—who were *Nazarites*, or vowed and dedicated to God, is to blend with the name of the city of Galilee a totally different word (נזר) and to seek a resemblance which does not exist, and a distinction in the external circumstances of life which our Lord did not exhibit.[1]

---

[1] Mill, pt. ii. pp. 406, 407.

[2] Mill, pt. ii. pp. 409—418.

The consideration of the corresponding part of S. Luke's narrative is reserved for the still expected section of Dr. Mill's observations, which will then have extended over so much of the evangelic history as affords any ground for the pretence that sufficient time elapsed between the alleged events and the construction of their record, to admit the effects of a mythicizing spirit. Although Strauss appears to have fallen in the estimation even of his own countrymen since the first publication of his work, we trust that the indications of a desire to obtrude writings of the same stamp on English readers may at least have one good effect, in inducing Dr. Mill to complete the work he has undertaken.

---

[1] Mill, pt. ii. pp. 420—432.

We have been endeavouring to put our readers in possession of the object and plan of a work which is not a mere exposure of the speculations of an unknown foreigner, nor a refutation of the last extravagance of scientific infidelity: in both its divisions it has a much stronger claim on the attention of theological students. Principles, which at the same time are cherished among the most contemplative people of the East, and command an almost idolatrous reverence for their supposed discoverers in a country connected with us in so many ways as Germany, must needs, in spite of their obscurity and unreality, have a subtle attraction for a large class of minds, and may exercise a very pernicious influence among us, however indisposed for such speculations our present habits of thought may appear. Nor in the historical portion of the work is our author a mere dealer in evidences, whose sole object—while comparatively indifferent to the subject matter of the history—is to remove objections, and to show that the sacred historians were probably neither deceivers nor deceived. While applying the stores of his varied and accurate learning to throw light upon some obscurity in the narrative, or to remove some supposed contradiction, his constant aim is to impress on his readers a sense of the reverence due to documents composed under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and of the infinite importance of the mysterious facts recorded in them. It is not only the clear intellect which, by a quick power of observation and fertility of illustration, commands the attention; but the earnestness of one who sees the malignant bearing of the errors he is combating upon the system of belief which is his own support, and who is thoroughly convinced that this system of truth is indissolubly bound up with the highest interests of mankind. Therefore, though Dr. Mill's sentences are often long, they will never be found so intricate as to provoke the complaint of earnest readers; and though some occasional harshness, or slight incorrectness of expression, may betray that he is too much taken up with graver matters to spare attention for the polishing of a sentence, they will not fail to be struck with many a passage whose vigour and manly eloquence declare that the writer's heart was in his work, and that he addresses such as will bring a heart as well as a head to the appreciation of his labour.

The question why public attention should be directed to a work for which, when at length translated into English, the author himself anticipates neglect[1] rather than opposition, will hardly be asked by any one who is acquainted with Dr. Mill's method of treating the subject: he himself, however, from the first anticipated the question, and one answer which he gave in justification of his proceeding was this; that whereas the rationalistic principle that what is supernatural is impossible, may lead those who adopt it either to explain what is really miraculous as the mere effect of natural causes, or to interpret it as an unhistoric mythus, (and Strauss himself has shown the former of these incompatible courses to be untenable,) the refutation of the latter must legitimately lead to the rejection of the principle itself. But it is obvious that another reason which he assigns has had far more weight with him. Dr. Mill writes for Englishmen, among whom it is not yet a first principle that supernatural interferences are in themselves incredible: and his object in exhibiting to them this exaggerated system is to check the progress of principles which he considers to have long met with some favour in this country, though rarely carried out so fully as in Germany. It is plain that, like Archbishop Parker, he 'dreads the Germanical natures' of our reformers of theology, and as a physician is best instructed by a case in which the symptoms are most fully developed, so he would have our theological students look on this as a case in which the temper and modes of thought which have been recommended to them are carried out in the most thorough-going manner. It is a somewhat delicate inquiry how far there is actually ground for such apprehensions in England; but, at all events, the advocates of this new philosophy abroad look forward with the utmost confidence to its extending its influence far beyond the limits of their own country. 'This treasure of the thoughts of the 'German nation,' says the historian of the latter systems of philosophy, 'with which it has been the endeavour of the present 'work to make our contemporaries acquainted, will, we dare 'entertain the hope, prove a benefit not only to Europe, but to 'the whole human race.'[1] And this is not merely the fond vision of some recluse academician, but the active diplomatist and man of the world—the very *legatus a latere* from the Head of the Church of the Future—who, while speaking contemptuously of the particular application of Strauss, assures us with equal ardour of the beneficial influence which these philosophical principles are to exert upon us. 'Fichte's Idealism carried him and many 'thousands to a longing after the eternal life in God which 'Christianity announces, while the watchmen of Zion could

---

[1] Ne, qui domi placuit, liber foris displiceat; aut cujus inter populares vel adversariorum numero creverat auctoritas, apud exteros neglectus in obscuro maneat. . . .

Qui si suum Hennellium non audiverunt de iisdem rebus cum Britannis Britannice agentem, quomodo audient si quis Germanus surget, &c.—*Advert. to English Translation.*

[1] Michelet, ii. 801.

trace in it here only a dry formulary of faith, there only the endless luxury of a tedious existence. Schelling's great fundamental idea of the Infinite and Unconditionate as the spirit, the fountain and the foundation of all that is finite and conditional, and of the divine unity of all antithetic life, [*gegensätzlichen;* meaning, apparently, opposed as divine and human] has given to the Idea that *independence of the externally historical* (*die Unabhängigkeit vom aüsserlich Geschichtlichen*) which Christianity presupposes and desires, and which it actually preserves in the hearts and in the inner experience of all believers.' 'Already, in Germany, it is a matter which can be mistaken by no unprejudiced person, to whom the appearances on the spiritual stage of German life have not remained unknown, that in spite of all the outcry of unbelief, and in spite of all actual confusion in the kingdom of God, German science and German philosophy have formed for themselves, within the last seventy years, a more firm and indestructible, because a more spiritual and living foundation for a new form of Christian life; and I add, without scruple, not for themselves alone, but for all mankind.'[1] Nor is a response to these sentiments wanting in our own country also. 'The thought,' says Archdeacon Hare, 'forces itself upon me, that in spite of the indiscriminate abuse which has been poured out so continually on modern German theology, they who desire a sound Christian interpretation of the Scriptures, bringing out their true meaning in its breadth and depth, will be much likelier to find it, if they only know where to look, in the living or recently deceased theologians of Germany, than in Aquinas or any of the schoolmen, nay, even than in any of the Fathers. Our praters about German theology are in the habit of choosing the evil and refusing the good, and evil there doubtless is in abundance. But there is also much good; and this good is all the better and the more instructive for having had to pass through such a fiery probation.'[2]

But it may be said that Hegel is only one among many, that his errors may be peculiar to himself, and that at any rate he is not one of the best known or most commended in the circle of our Germanizing countrymen. It is certain, however, that his followers regard his system as the legitimate development and consummation of the teaching of his better known predecessors. Kant, Jacobi, Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel, are 'the heroes' of

---

[1] Bunsen, Verfassung der Kirche der Zukunft, pp. 162, 363.

[2] Mission of the Comforter, pp. 934, 935. This improving process may be illustrated by Mr. Hare's description of Luecke, who 'having had to wade through the slough of Rationalism in his youth, like most of his contemporaries, has some of its mud sticking to him.'—*Id.* p. 485.

Michelet, out of whose circle, 'no originality, no ray of a new 'principle is to be perceived;' but Hegel is 'the Colossus of 'science on whom the other figures will lean in an unconstrained 'manner, and group themselves around him.' He, as we have already seen, is considered to have combined the views of Kant and Fichte with those of Schelling; and in 'the objective idealism' the historian has to 'consider, first Schelling, secondly 'his school, thirdly Solger, who forms the immediate passage to 'Hegel, and may be looked upon as *the Baptist and Forerunner* 'of the absolute idealism, for which *he prepared the way*.'[1] And this seems to hold of critical as well as philosophical principles, for Schelling is named among those who 'have set up the idea 'of Mythus, as one which holds generally, (einen *allgemein* 'gültigen) for all most ancient history, sacred as well as profane.'[2] Certainly some of Hegel's most serious errors are common to his early master also. If 'Baur has rightly hit the meaning of Hegel's teaching' in denying 'the Incarnation as an individual, 'once occurring, historic matter of fact,' it is likewise Schelling's teaching that 'no such thought can be entertained, as that God 'has assumed human nature in a definite moment of time, since 'God is eternally without all time (ewig ausser aller Zeit). The 'Incarnation of God is, therefore, an Incarnation from eternity. 'The man Christ is, therefore, in the manifestation only the 'summit, and in the same proportion also the beginning again of 'the same: since it will continue itself on from Him, through the 'fact that all His followers are members of one and the same 'Body of which He is the Head.'[3] Just as Strauss asks whether 'the Incarnation of God from eternity is not a truer thing than 'one in an exclusive point of time?' and supposes himself to give reality to the idea of the union of divine and human nature, by apprehending *the whole of humanity* as the subject. And Mr. Coleridge must have considered the philosophy of Schelling to involve the same fundamental error, against which Dr. Mill has been contending as developed by Hegel and Strauss, when he declared that the inevitable result of that reasoning in which the intellect fancied it possessed within itself the centre of its own system 'is, and from Zeno the Eleatic to Spinoza, and from 'Spinoza to the *Schellings*, Okens, and their adherents of the 'present day, ever has been, pantheism under one or other of its 'modes, the least repulsive of which differs from the rest, not in 'its consequences, which are one and the same in all, and in all 'alike are practically atheistic, but only as it may express the 'striving of the philosopher himself to hide these consequences 'from his own mind.'[4] Or to take Fichte, whose services to philosophy and religion are so warmly acknowledged by M. Bunsen: the historian tells us that 'the work by which he sought 'to fill up the gaps in his earlier system will not help him much 'in the eyes of the unphilosophical; for instead of the charge of 'atheism which their leaders had before fulminated against him, 'they will now hurl against him that of pantheism: and not 'without reason, for he was full of God.' 'Pure Spinozism 'appears, in one place, in his Lectures on the Nature of the 'Scholar:' a work which, if we mistake not, has been recently translated into English to aid the progress of the transcendental philosophy. But the following passages are from the 'Religionslehre,' which Fichte himself 'considered the summit and 'brightest light-point of his philosophizing.' 'The absolute and 'ever-true standing-point is, that at all times, *in every one without 'exception*, who has a living insight into his union with God, and 'who truly and indeed surrenders his whole individual life to the 'divine life in him, the Eternal Word, without reserve or 'restraint, *altogether in the same manner as in Jesus Christ, becomes 'flesh*, a personally sensible and human being, (sinnliches und 'menschliches Dasein.) . . . But how Christ, who is distinguished 'from the ages before and after him as the sole possessor of this 'insight into the *absolute identity of humanity with the Divinity*, 'has acquired this, is the stupendous wonder by which (in a 'manner peculiar, and attained by no individual but Himself) 'He is the Only and First-born Son of God. But now, after 'the consummation, all difference is removed: the whole society, 'the first-born equally with those born after, again become united 'in the one common Life-spring of all, the Deity. And so 'Christianity, having gained its end, becomes again united with 'absolute truth: and itself declares that every one can and will 'attain unity with God, and *become* himself *His presence or the 'Eternal Word in His Personality. So long as man desires to be 'anything himself*, God comes not to him: for no man can become 'God. *But so soon as he annihilates* (vernichtet) *himself purely, 'thoroughly, and radically, God alone remains existent, and is all in 'all.* Man cannot produce God; but *he can annihilate himself*, 'as the proper negation, *and thus is absorbed* (versinket) *in God*.'[1] It seems difficult to distinguish between these statements, and those to which Dr. Mill has found a counterpart in the pantheistic speculations of Hindu philosophers. And it must be repeated that it is to these writers—'the laity,'—'the philosophical schools from Kant to Hegel,'—that M. Bunsen, a competent judge in this matter at least, ascribes that progress of mental culture in Germany, and that new form of Christian life, which are to prove so efficacious in enlightening and elevating the whole human race. It is true that even Archdeacon Hare, in spite of his petulant criticism upon Dr. Mill, can himself in his calmer moments discover some difference between the philosophy of Hegel and the religion of Christ. He cannot give to Baur, for instance, the same unqualified approval which Strauss bestows, but admits that 'in some of his works the 'Hegelian predominates over the Christian, to the great disparagement and sacrifice of Christian truth.' 'Conradi . . . a 'disciple of the Hegelian school in philosophy, has laboured 'strenuously,' he tells us, 'to reconcile his philosophy with his 'religion, and to exhibit the forms which Christian truth must 'assume when viewed through the spectacles of that philosophy '—a task in which several other able men of the same school 'have lately been engaged with more or less of success, *sometimes with a grievous sacrifice of Christian truth, sometimes, it may 'be, at the cost of their philosophical and logical consistency.*'[1] And no wonder, when from one of themselves (Goeschel) 'it is 'reported that the confession has escaped, that he had at length 'arrived at the conviction that Christianity and speculative 'philosophy are different, not only in their form, but in sub'stance also.'[2] But it does seem a marvellous want of discretion to heap lavish praise upon a school in whose speculations the most cherished articles of a Christian's faith are so little respected, and to commend the writings of such untrustworthy guides to those whose convictions still need to be strengthened, or their opinions to be modified. Possibly such expressions may sometimes be the offspring of a warm temper and a fluent pen rather than of the deliberate judgment; and sometimes perhaps a favourite phraseology conciliates indulgence to sentiments which would be rejected if expressed in ordinary language. For there is a formalism of phrases and ideas, as well as of outward acts: and while the assumption of this external garb—in philosophy as well as in religion—is thought by the more superficial followers to give them a superiority over the rest of the world, (which is as arrogantly asserted as it is cheaply acquired,) the more earnest leaders, in their zeal for the extension of their views, may too readily approve those who are provided with such watchwords. But while we question both the influence and the extent of the school 'whose doctrinal theology is 'in a great measure modified, if not formed, by the study of the 'great Protestant writers of the continent,' and which is said to be united 'by the same eclectic-philosophical spirit, and the same admiration of intellect wherever it developes itself,'[1] we apprehend that the minds of its members cannot fail to be unsettled and perverted when they pursue the study of this speculative theology without being continually on their guard against its besetting errors. We venture to ask whether some indication of this may not be found even in the writings of Mr. Coleridge, notwithstanding his earnest rejection of Pantheism as only Atheism under another name. Thus he has said: 'I should ' have no objection to define reason with Jacobi, and with his ' friend Hemsterhuis, as an organ, bearing the same relation to ' spiritual objects, the universal, the eternal and the necessary, ' as the eye bears to material and contingent phenomena. But ' then it must be added that it is *an organ identical with its appropriate objects.* Thus God, the soul, eternal truth, &c. are ' the objects of reason: but they are themselves reason.'[2] Is not this equivalent to saying that the soul which is employed in contemplating the Divine Essence is identical therewith? or, in the German phrase, to attaining an insight into the oneness of the Divine and Human? Or let us take an extract from Goeschel, a writer of the school of Hegel, which Archdeacon Hare introduces thus:—

---

[1] Michelet, i. 8, 34; ii. 209.

[2] Strauss und die Evangelien, p. 17.

[3] Michelet, ii. 654, 350.

[4] The Friend, iii. 214.

---

[1] Michelet, ii. 198, 202, 203. In the system of Schelling this was more briefly expressed; 'Existence is the one and peculiar sin.' Die einzige und eigentliche Sünde ist eben die Existenz selbst.'—*Michelet*, ii. 370.

---

[1] Mission of the Comforter, pp. 781, 492.

[2] Michelet, ii. 646.

> 'When speaking of the manner in which Hegel had overcome the subjective character of the systems of his immediate predecessors by demonstrating the unity and identity of the subjective with the objective, he remarks: "We may find an example of this in the highest of all phenomena, *i.e.* the appearance of God in man, as in the flesh. This is adequate to that which it contains and identical therewith; consequently the contents, *i.e.* the fulness of the Godhead, are included in the phenomenon, for the substance does not transcend the form more than this surpasses itself, and by negativing itself preserves its continuity. Christian theology expresses the same truth, when it teaches us that the manifestation of God in man only attained its completion in the death of the Son of Man. The unbelief in the Deity of Christ, which is the sin of the world and of this age, rests upon that unbelief which characterized the critical and the transcendental philosophy, in the identity of the phenomenon with its contents, of the form with the substance, or of the finite with the infinite; which last is indeed transcendent, but for this very reason is only the more identical with the phenomenon." '

Now this passage is not—as might be thought—produced by Archdeacon Hare as an instance of the detriment which Christian doctrine has sustained in its connexion with the modern philosophy, nor for the purpose of condemning the supposed principle, to which Strauss would sacrifice the truth of the Evangelic history, that the finite and infinite are identical, the one being merely the manifestation of the other; but his remark upon it is simply that 'here we find an answer by anticipation

---

[1] Tait's Letter to the Vice-Chancellor, pp. 12, 16.

[2] The Friend, i. 208; compare also iii. 205, note.

'to the fallacy which lies at the bottom of Strauss's Life of 'Christ; that the idea can never have an adequate exponent.'[1] But let us endeavour to ascertain what is the amount of the difference between Strauss and Goeschel, which can be established from this passage. It asserts an 'identity of the phenomenon with its contents, of the form with the substance, or of 'the finite with the infinite.' The infinite, or substance, or contents, is stated to be 'the fulness of the Godhead;' the finite, the form, or phenomenon, must as plainly be the manhood in which Christ appeared; and Goeschel does but agree with Strauss in maintaining the identity of these, *i. e.* of the Divine and human Natures. 'The form surpasses itself, and by negativing itself preserves its continuity;' for as Hegel teaches (Michelet, ii. 646) that 'the Subject, which would be *a distinct person* in contradistinction to the Divine Substance, is evil,' the renunciation of distinct personality restores the human and finite again to the Divine and infinite, and gives it continuity by negativing the finiteness which was its characteristic. And this also agrees with Strauss's explanation of the death of Christ as the negation of a negation. If, then, there be any difference between Goeschel and Strauss it consists in this: that whereas the former admits (if indeed he does so) that the idea of *God in man* had an adequate exponent in the person of the historic Christ, Strauss—so miserably low is his idea of the Divinity—cannot conceive that God appearing in man could have realized the representation which the Scriptures give and the Church believes of the *individual* Christ, or—so gross is his inconsistency—maintains that the only adequate exponent is to be found in the *collected human race,* while acknowledging that 'Christ 'has reached the highest aim of religion—that a man in his 'immediate consciousness should know himself to be one with God.'[2] The whole passage is cited to show how Archdeacon Hare, who doubtless has no sympathy with the anti-historic disposition of Strauss, can entirely overlook the doctrinal errors of a passage as objectionable as anything that Strauss could have written.

And to pass from the speculative to the more practical tendencies of the school, is there not the same disposition in all these writers, not merely to reject all interpretative tradition, but to mould and fashion the Scriptures themselves according to the rule of their own infallible reason? Luecke is indeed 'perverse and pertinacious,' in the estimation of Archdeacon Hare, when—differing from him in the interpretation of a passage—he 'maintains that S. John had not apprehended our Lord's meaning quite correctly,' but he bestows his unqualified admiration upon Neander, who perpetually treats the Evangelic writers in the same irreverent way. To give an instance or two. Of the Magi: 'But how they learned, when they were 'come to Jerusalem, that the chosen Child was born at Beth'lehem—as to this we *will not answer with the same certainty for* '*the truth of the relations of Matthew.* . . They might in any case 'be conducted to Bethlehem, the little city of the Nativity, 'through many assistances of Providence in the ordinary course 'of things—as, for instance, by meeting with the shepherds or 'other holy persons who had been concerned in the great 'event. And as they entered the house, *they might so picture* '*the matter, as it appeared to them according to their subjective* '*point of view,* when they arrived there and looked up to the 'starry heavens.'[1] Of the Sermon on the Mount: '*The repre*'*sentation of Luke rests upon a defective apprehension of the dis*'*course* by a hearer who understood the beatitudes in too narrow 'and limited a manner, who explained the ideas—poor, hunger'ing, mourning,—in too external a way, and so misunderstood 'them . . . As in this we cannot overlook the blending together 'of what is really distinct, and the consequent abridgment of 'the original discourse, so *in the repeated "woe,"* which imitates 'the beatitude, *we may remark a rhetorical colouring.* It is easy 'to explain how such a representation as in Luke might arise 'out of the organism of the discourse which Matthew has 'handed down to us, *through a defective and limited apprehension,* '(durch lückenhafte und beschränkte Auffassung).[2] In the following passages—though still taken from the work in which Neander appears as the avowed opponent of Strauss—it is yet more obvious that the decision of the critic is influenced by a similar indisposition to admit miraculous circumstances in the narrative. Of the pool of Bethesda: 'That legend, which, 'according to the most trustworthy critical investigations, does 'not belong to John, but is founded on an ancient gloss, *the* '*legend of the angel which at certain times descended and troubled* '*the water,* so that it possessed a special medicinal virtue, itself 'in its origin presupposes the peculiar appearance, which the 'popular tradition sought to explain by such a supernatural 'cause.'[3] Of the calling of Judas: 'Christ may have recog'nised in him an energy, which if animated by a pure intention, 'might have made him a peculiarly active instrument for the 'extension of the kingdom of God. Along with this He may 'have been aware of the disturbing force of the sensual self-seeking element in him, as in the other apostles, *but He may have hoped to overcome this*, as it actually came to pass with the others, through the illuminating and purifying influence of His intercourse with him, since this was dependent on the free self-determination of Judas, *the direction of which could be known beforehand in an infallible manner only by the Omniscient.*'[1] Strauss himself will tell us how great has been the progress of this sort of criticism in Germany since his own Life of Christ first appeared. 'Narrationes in Evangeliis traditas, quas rerum vere gestarum esse persuadere mihi non potueram, mythorum in modum, qui inter antiquas gentes inveniuntur, aut in ore populi a minutis initiis coaluisse et eundo crevisse, aut *a singulis, sed qui vere ita evenisse superstitiose in animum induxerant, fictas esse existimaveram.* Quod ut sufficit explicandis plerisque eorum quæ dubitationem moventia tribus prioribus Evangeliis continentur: ita *quarti Evangelii auctorem ad tuendas et illustrandas sententias suas haud raro meras fabulas scientem confinxisse, a Baurio, theologo Tubingensi doctissimo, nuper ita demonstratum est,* ut critici me judicii rigori religiosius quam verius temperasse intelligam. Dumque prima a Christo sæcula accuratius perscrutantur, partes partiumque certamina, quibus nova Ecclesia commovebatur, in apricum proferunt, narrationum haud paucarum, quas fabulas esse ego bene quidem perspexeram, sed unde ortæ essent demonstrare non valueram, veram in illis primæ ecclesiæ motibus originem detegere theologis Tubingensibus contigit.'[2]

---

[1] Mission of the Comforter, p. 584.

[2] Strauss's Polemical Writings, in Mich. ii. 649.

---

[1] Neander, Leben Jesu, p. 30. [2] Ibid. p. 155, note. [3] Ibid. p. 318.

And must we not say that in Mr. Coleridge's writings there are traces to be discerned of the same disposition to submit the records of revelation to the measure of the subjective mind, and to reject—whatever might be the witness of tradition or the judgment of the Church—such portions as seemed to him unworthy of a divine origin, or were discordant from his own system of thought? With a mind which reverently and affectionately received the great articles of the Catholic Creed, and which would have rejected with indignation and abhorrence the low philosophy which directs the soul to the progress of physical science as its main source of encouragement and consolation, does he not unduly enlarge the province of the intellect, and supply a precedent to those of a less sound faith for retrenchments of Scripture, against which he would himself have earnestly protested, because happily his own right faith felt the value of the threatened portions? Such—not to speak more particularly of the manner in which he treats the blessing pronounced upon Jael by Deborah the prophetess, or what he calls 'the Grecisms and heavier difficulties in the biographical chapters of the book of Daniel,'—is the following sentence, in which he is speaking more with reference to the New Testament:

---

[1] Leben Jesu, p. 225.

[2] *Advertisement* prefixed to the English translation of his Life of Jesus.

> 'Accommodations of elder Scriptural phrases—that favourite ornament and garnish of Jewish eloquence—incidental allusions to popular notions, traditions, apologues—(for example, the dispute between the Devil and the Archangel Michael about the body of Moses, *Jude* 9,)—fancies and anachronisms imported from the synagogue of Alexandria into Palestine, by, or together with, the Septuagint version, and applied as mere *argumenta ad homines*—(for example, the delivery of the law by the disposition of angels, *Acts* vii. 53, *Gal.* iii. 19, *Heb.* ii. 2,)—these, detached from their context, and contrary to the intention of the sacred writer, first raised into independent *theses*, and then brought together to produce or sanction some new *credendum*, for which neither separately could have furnished a pretence!'[1]

And these are the letters which Dr. Arnold considered so 'well fitted to break ground in the approaches to that momentous question which involves in it so great a shock to existing notions; the greatest, probably, that has ever been given since the discovery of the falsehood of the doctrine of the Pope's infallibility.'[2] It is remarkable, also, that we find the latter (while treating Strauss's anti-historic theory with the contempt which might have been expected), speaking of the book of Daniel just in the same way as Strauss does; 'I have long thought that the greater part of the book of Daniel is most certainly a very late work, of the time of the Maccabees; and the pretended prophecy about the kings of Grecia and Persia, and of the north and south, is mere history, like the poetical prophecies in Virgil and elsewhere.' It is true that he considered 'the non-authenticity of great part of Daniel' to be proved by 'the self-same criticism which has established the authenticity of S. John's gospel against all questionings;' but there was also the consideration that 'the latter chapters of Daniel, if genuine, would be *a clear exception to my canon of interpretation, as there can be no reasonable spiritual meaning made out of the kings of the north and south.*'[3] And it must be remembered that Dr. Arnold, who at an earlier period (1835) speaks of Luecke and the other contributors to the *Studien und Kritiken*, as 'utterly unlike what is called Rationalism, and at the same time so unlike our High-Church or Evangelical writings,—a most pure transcript of the New Testament, combining in a most extraordinary degree the spirit of love with the spirit of wisdom,' in one of his latest letters declared,

---

[1] Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit, pp. 48, 49.

[2] Life and Correspondence, i. 394. Second Edition.

[3] Life, ii. 191, 192.

'I scarcely know one amongst my dearest friends, *except* '*Bunsen*, whom I do not believe to be, in some point or other, 'in grave error.''[1]

We apprehend that these latter passages indicate the direction in which the study of German theology is likely to manifest its effects at the present time. So long as English education and tastes remain what they now are, the whole works of Kant, Fichte, and Schelling, might probably be circulated throughout England without gaining as many adherents to the school, *for its own sake*, as it has produced writers in Germany. Our studies do not dispose us to look with much favour on teachers who seem to shrink from the statement of any positive and definite principle, and whose greatest success is often in disposing the veil of an affected diction, so as most to increase the original obscurity of their ideas. And if the principles of the philosophy were more clear and sure, and better recommended by the sober judgment and temper of their advocates, it would need much boldness to predict their extensive reception in an age so eager in its pursuit of secular advantages, and labouring under a feverish excitement to make progress in a race of which the prize, like the course, is on earth. But in a mind which is engrossed with these material objects, and has learned to look on the discoveries which have been made in connexion with them as the glory and excellence of the age, there is likely to be a mixture of unbelief, false shame, and vanity, which will prepare it for the ready reception of such professedly great and admirable intellectual discoveries; and so we may expect to find among ourselves also persons who will give their judgment that Christianity is the most perfect of all religions, but who will endeavour to reduce its revelations and requirements to the measure which the progress of the age will admit. To such persons the writings of the German school will be serviceable, as furnishing them with critical or philosophical grounds for eliminating those portions of Scripture which are deemed inconsistent with modern culture, because no counterpart to them is found in our present experience; and thus, while less submission and faith are required of the intellect, they will be enabled to contemplate with more complacency the elevation to which their philosophy has raised them. The narratives of Scripture which have provoked the objections or the ridicule of sceptics, may now be referred for their origin to the subjective mind, or the defective apprehension of the reporter; and the constitution of the Church, which has heretofore been believed to be established by a perpetual ordinance of Christ and His Apostles, and has thus furnished a test and exercise of the obedience and humility of the members, may now be discarded as earthly and antiquated, or be modified at the dictate of the popular breath.[1]

---

[1] Life, i. 405; ii. 270.

It is not, we may well believe, by applying ourselves to the criticism of the Scriptures with a desire to *remove* whatever may have furnished a ground for objection, and to make them acceptable to the boasted illumination of the age, that we shall present Christianity in such a form as to convey spiritual and moral strength; Divine revelation speaks not as do the Scribes and Pharisees, but with authority, and must be received with humility and submission, if it is to enlighten and purify those who recognise it. In such wise has it ever been set forth by the Catholic Church, which, resting upon the ordinance of Christ, has itself in turn been the pillar on which the truth has been engraved, and set up and made visible to the eyes of men. And though at one time the storm of persecution may assail it, and at another the deceitfulness of unbelief may fret against it, it has a promise of perpetuity which no human invention or institution may boast, and the pride of philosophy—as the pride of power—shall wither before it. Only may English Churchmen remember where their true strength is to be found, and support themselves on God's promise of care and protection, and his gracious gifts to His Church, until this tyranny and presumption be overpast.

---

[1] M. Bunsen's opinion is, that it 'is a lawful act of national sovereignty,' if Episcopacy be 'made the badge of Churchship constitutionally and nationally;' but if it be done 'on principle, and Catholically—the death-blow is aimed at that Church's inmost life;' i.e. there is no harm in our receiving it as ordained by the civil authority in any nation, but it is a renunciation of Christianity to look upon it as ordained by our Lord and His Apostles for the whole Church.—Verfassung der Kirche der Zukunft, pp. 409, 410.

ART. IV.—*Jane Eyre: an Autobiography.* *By* CURRER BELL. Second Edition. Smith, Elder and Co., Cornhill.

SINCE the publication of 'Grantley Manor,' no novel has created so much sensation as 'Jane Eyre.' Indeed, the public taste seems to have outstripped its guides in appreciating the remarkable power which this book displays. For no leading review has yet noticed it, and here we have before us the second edition. The name and sex of the writer are still a mystery. Currer Bell (which by a curious Hibernicism appears in the title-page as the name of a female autobiographer) is a mere *nom de guerre*—perhaps an anagram. However, we, for our part, cannot doubt that the book is written by a female, and, as certain provincialisms indicate, by one from the North of England. Who, indeed, but a woman could have ventured, with the smallest prospect of success, to fill three octavo volumes with the history of a woman's heart? The hand which drew Juliet and Miranda would have shrunk from such a task. That the book is readable, is to us almost proof enough of the truth of our hypothesis. But we could accumulate evidences to the same effect. Mr. Rochester, the hero of the story, is as clearly the vision of a woman's fancy, as the heroine is the image of a woman's heart. Besides, there are many minor indications of a familiarity with all the mysteries of female life which no man can possess, or would dare to counterfeit. Those who have read Miss Edgeworth's Montem, and know how a lady paints the social nature of boys and the doings of boys' schools, may judge *e converso* what work a man would have made of the girls' school in the first volume of Jane Eyre. Yet we cannot wonder that the hypothesis of a male author should have been started, or that ladies especially should still be rather determined to uphold it. For a book more unfeminine, both in its excellences and defects, it would be hard to find in the annals of female authorship. Throughout there is masculine power, breadth and shrewdness, combined with masculine hardness, coarseness, and freedom of expression. Slang is not rare. The humour is frequently produced by a use of Scripture, at which one is rather sorry to have smiled. The love-scenes glow with a fire as fierce as that of Sappho, and somewhat more fuliginous. There is an intimate acquaintance with the worst parts of human nature, a practised sagacity in discovering the latent ulcer, and a ruthless rigour in exposing it, which must command our admiration, but are almost startling in one of the softer sex. Jane Eyre professes to be an autobiography, and we think it likely that in some essential respects it is so. If the authoress has not been, like her heroine, an oppressed orphan, a starved and bullied charity-school girl, and a despised and slighted governess (and the intensity of feeling which she shows in speaking of the wrongs of this last class seems to prove that they have been her own), at all events we fear she is one to whom the world has not been kind. And, assuredly, never was unkindness more cordially repaid. Never was there a better hater. Every page burns with moral Jacobinism. 'Unjust, unjust,' is the burden of every reflection upon the things and powers that be. All virtue is but well masked vice, all religious profession and conduct is but the whitening of the sepulchre, all self-denial is but deeper selfishness. In the preface to the second edition, this temper rises to the transcendental pitch. There our authoress is Micaiah, and her generation Ahab; and the Ramoth Gilead, which is to be the reward of disregarding her denunciations, is looked forward to with at least as much of unction as of sorrow: although we think that even the doomed King of Israel might have stood excused for his blindness, if the prophet had opened his message of wrath with a self-laudatory preface and eight closely-printed pages of panegyrical quotations, culled with omnivorous vanity from every kind of newspaper.

We select the following extract as an illustration of our remarks—a specimen at once of extraordinary powers of analyzing character and moral painting, and of a certain want of feeling in their exercise which defeats the moral object, and causes a reaction in the mind of the reader like that of a barbarous execution in the mind of the beholder. To render the passage intelligible, it is only necessary to premise that Jane Eyre, the heroine of the tale, is an orphan committed to the care of Mrs. Reed, her aunt, who after maltreating the child till she breaks out into a wild rebellion, sends her to a charity school to live or die as she may. Jane Eyre lives. Aunt Reed is dying, and Jane Eyre is at her bedside.

'"I am very ill, I know," she said ere long. "I was trying to turn myself a few minutes since, and find I cannot move a limb. It is as well I should ease my mind before I die: what we think little of in health, burdens us at such an hour as the present is to me. Is the nurse here? or is there no one in the room but you?"

'I assured her we were alone.

'"Well, I have twice done you a wrong which I regret now. One was in breaking the promise which I gave my husband to bring you up as my own child; the other——" she stopped. "After all, it is of no great importance perhaps," she murmured to herself: "and then, I may get better; and to humble myself so to her is painful."

'She made an effort to alter her position, but failed: her face changed; she seemed to experience some inward sensation—the precursor perhaps of the last pang.

'"Well: I must give it over. Eternity is before me: I had better tell her. Go to my dressing-case, open it, and take out a letter you will see there."

'I obeyed her directions. "Read the letter," she said.

'It was short and thus conceived:—

'Madam,

'Will you have the goodness to send me the address of my niece, Jane Eyre, and to tell me how she is: it is my intention to write shortly, and desire her to come to me at Madeira. Providence has blessed my endeavours to secure a competency; and as I am unmarried and childless, I wish to adopt her during my life, and bequeath her at my death whatever I may have to leave.

'I am, Madam, &c. &c.

'JOHN EYRE, Madeira.'

'It was dated three years back.

'"Why did I never hear of this?" I asked.

'"Because I disliked you too fixedly and thoroughly ever to lend a hand in lifting you to prosperity. I could not forget your conduct to me, Jane,—the fury with which you once turned on me; the tone in which you declared you abhorred me the worst of anybody in the world; the unchildlike look and voice with which you affirmed that the very thought of me made you sick, and asserted that I had treated you with miserable cruelty. I could not forget my own sensations when you thus started up and poured out the venom of your mind: I felt fear as if an animal that I struck or pushed had looked up at me with human eyes and cursed me with a man's voice. Bring me some water! Oh, make haste!"

'"Dear Mrs. Reed," said I, as I offered her the draught she required, "think no more of all this, let it pass away from your mind. Forgive me for my passionate language: I was a child then; eight, nine years have passed since that day."

'She heeded nothing of what I had said; but when she had tasted the water and drawn breath, she went on thus:—

'"I tell you I could not forget it; and I took my revenge: for you to be adopted by your uncle, and placed in a state of ease and comfort, was what I could not endure. I wrote to him; I said I was sorry for his disappointment, but Jane Eyre was dead: she had died of typhus fever at Lowood. Now act as you please: write and contradict my assertion—expose my falsehood as soon as you like. You were born, I think, to be my torment; my last hour is racked by the recollection of a deed, *which but for you, I should never have been tempted to commit.*"

'"If you could but be persuaded to think no more of it, aunt, and to regard me with kindness and forgiveness ——"

'"You have a very bad disposition," said she, "and one to this day I feel it impossible to understand: how for nine years you could be patient and quiescent under any treatment, and in the tenth break out all fire and violence, I can never comprehend."

'"My disposition is not so bad as you think: I am passionate, but not vindictive. Many a time, as a little child, I should have been glad to love you, if you would have let me; and I long earnestly to be reconciled to you now: kiss me, aunt."

'I approached my cheek to her lips: she would not touch it. She said I oppressed her by leaning over the bed; and again demanded water. As *I laid* her down—for I raised her and supported her on my arm while she drank—I covered her ice-cold and clammy hand with mine: the feeble fingers shrank from my touch—the glazing eyes shunned my gaze.

'"Love me, then, or hate me, as you will," I said at last, "you have my full and free forgiveness: ask now for God's; and be at peace."

'*Poor, suffering woman! it was too late for her to make now the effort to change her habitual frame of mind; living she had ever hated me—dying, she must hate me still.*

* * * * * *

'I yet lingered half an hour longer, hoping to see some sign of amity: *but she gave none.* She was fast relapsing into stupor; nor did her mind again rally: at twelve o'clock that night she died. I was not present to close her eyes, nor were either of her daughters. They came to tell us the next morning that all was over. She was by that time laid out. Eliza and I went to look at her: Georgiana, who had burst out into loud weeping, said she dared not go. There was stretched Sarah Reed's once robust and active frame, rigid and still: her eye of flint was covered with its cold lid; her brow and strong traits wore yet the impress of her inexorable soul. A strange and solemn object was that corpse to me. I gazed on it with gloom and pain: nothing soft, nothing sweet, nothing pitying, or hopeful, or subduing, did it inspire; only a grating anguish for *her* woes—not *my* loss—and a sombre tearless dismay at the fearfulness of death in such a form.

'Eliza surveyed her parent calmly. After a silence of some minutes she *observed*:—"With her constitution she should have lived to a good old age: her life was shortened by trouble." And then a spasm constricted her mouth for an instant: as it passed away she turned and left the room, and so did I. Neither of us had dropt a tear.'—Vol. ii. p. 177—182.

Here we have a deathbed of unrepentant sin described with as deliberate a minuteness and as serene a tranquillity as a naturalist might display in recording the mortal orgasms of a jelly-fish. It is the despair of Beaufort—the 'He dies and makes no sign,' without the response, 'O God, forgive him!' All the expressions of tenderness and forgiveness, on the part of the injured Jane, are skilfully thrown in so as to set off to the utmost the unconquerable hardness of the dying sinner's heart. They are the pleadings of the good angel, made audible, and rejected to the last. We are compelled to see and acknowledge beyond the possibility of doubt, that Mrs. Reed dies without remorse, without excuse, and without hope.

The plot is most extravagantly improbable, verging all along upon the supernatural, and at last running fairly into it. All the power is shown and all the interest lies in the characters. We have before intimated our belief, that in Jane Eyre, the heroine of the piece, we have, in some measure, a portrait of the writer. If not, it is a most skilful imitation of autobiography. The character embodied in it is precisely the same as that which pervades the whole book, and breaks out most signally in the Preface—a temper naturally harsh, made harsher by ill usage, and visiting both its defect and its wrongs upon the world—an understanding disturbed and perverted by cynicism, but still strong and penetrating—fierce love and fiercer hate—all this viewed from within and coloured by self-love. We only wish we could carry our hypothesis a step further, and suppose that the triumph which the loving and loveable element finally obtains over the unloving and unloveable in the fictitious character had also its parallel in the true. But we fear that few readers will rise from the book with that impression.

The character of Mr. Rochester, the hero, the lover, and eventually the husband, of Jane Eyre, we have already noticed as being, to our minds, the characteristic production of a female pen. Not an Adonis, but a Hercules in mind and body, with a frame of adamant, a brow of thunder and a lightning eye, a look and voice of command, all-knowing and all-discerning, fierce in love and hatred, rough in manner, rude in courtship, with a shade of Byronic gloom and appetizing mystery—add to this that when loved he is past middle age, and when wedded he is blind and fire-scarred, and you have such an Acis as no male writer would have given his Galatea, and yet what commends itself as a true embodiment of the visions of a female imagination. The subordinate characters almost all show proportionate power. Mr. Brocklehurst, the patron and bashaw of Lowood, a female orphan school, in which he practises self-denial, *alieno ventre*, and exercises a vicarious humility, is a sort of compound of Squeers and Pecksniff, but more probable than either, and drawn with as strong a hand. His first interview with Jane Eyre, in which he appears to the eye of the child 'like a black pillar,' and a scene at Lowood in which, from the midst of a galaxy of smartly dressed daughters, he lectures the half-starved and half-clothed orphans on his favourite virtues, would be well worth quoting, but that their humour borders on the profane. His love of miracles of destruction is a true hit. *Those* miracles are still credible. So is the inscription on the wall of Lowood. 'Lowood Institution. This portion was rebuilt A.D. —, by 'Naomi Brocklehurst, of Brocklehurst Hall, in this county.' 'Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your 'good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven.' Mrs. Reed is a good type of the 'strong-minded' and odious woman. Excellent too, in an artistic point of view, is the character of St. John Rivers, the Calvinist clergyman and missionary, with all its complex attributes and iridescent hues—self-denial strangely shot with selfishness—earthly pride and restless ambition blending and alternating with heaven-directed zeal, and resignation to the duties of a heavenly mission. The feeblest character in the book is that of Helen Burns, who is meant to be a perfect Christian, and is a simple seraph, conscious moreover of her own perfection. She dies early in the first volume, and our authoress might say of her saint, as Shakspeare said of his Mercutio, 'If I had not killed her, she would have killed me.' In her, however, the Christianity of Jane Eyre is concentrated, and with her it expires, leaving the moral world in a kind of Scandinavian gloom, which is hardly broken by the faint glimmerings of a 'doctrine of the equality of souls,' and some questionable streaks of that 'world-redeeming creed of Christ,' which being emancipated from 'narrow human doctrines, that only tend to elate and magnify a few,' is seldom invoked but for the purpose of showing that all Christian profession is bigotry and all Christian practice is hypocrisy.

In imaginative painting Jane Eyre is very good. Take the following—probably from the threshold of the lake country—the neighbourhood of Kirby Lonsdale.

> 'I discovered, too, that a great pleasure, an enjoyment which the horizon only bounded, lay all outside the high and spike-guarded walls of our garden: this pleasure consisted in a prospect of noble summits girdling a great hill hollow, rich in verdure and shadow; in a bright beck, full of dark stones and sparkling eddies. How different had this scene looked when I viewed it laid out beneath the iron sky of winter, stiffened in frost, shrouded with snow! When mists as chill as death wandered to the impulse of east winds along those purple peaks, and rolled down "ing" and holm till they blended with the frozen fog of the beck! That beck itself was then a torrent, turbid and curbless: it tore asunder the wood, and sent a raving sound through the air, often thickened with wild rain or whirling sleet; and for the forest on its banks, *that* showed only ranks of skeletons.
>
> 'April advanced to May: a bright, serene May it was; days of blue sky, placid sunshine, and soft western or southern gales filled up its duration. And now vegetation matured with vigour: Lowood shook its tresses: it became all green, all flowery; its great elm, ash and oak skeletons were restored to majestic life; woodland plants sprang up profusely in its recesses; unnumbered varieties of moss filled its hollows, and it made a strange grand sunshine out of the wealth of its wild primrose plants.'—Vol. i. pp. 145, 146.

The rather ambitious descriptions of manners and social life which the book contains are, we are bound to say, a most decided failure. Their satire falls back with accumulated force upon the head of the satirist. It is 'high life below stairs' with a vengeance; the fashionable world seen through the area railings, and drawn with the black end of the kitchen poker. Listen to the polite badinage of Mr. Rochester's drawing room.

> '"Certainly, my best;" says Lady Ingram to her daughter, "and I was quite right; depend on that: there are a thousand reasons why *liaisons* between governesses and tutors should never be tolerated a moment in any well-regulated house; firstly—"
>
> '"Oh gracious, mamma! Spare us the enumeration! *Au reste*, we all know them: danger of bad example to innocence of childhood; distractions and consequent neglect of duty on the part of the attached; mutual alliance and reliance; confidence thence resulting—insolence accompanying—mutiny and *general blow up*. Am I right, Baroness Ingram, of Ingram Park?"
>
> '"*My lily-flower*, you are right now, as always."

Or the following playful coquetry between the said lily-flower and Mr. Rochester:—

'"Mr. Rochester, do you second my motion?"

'"Madam, I support you on this point as on every other."

'"Then on me be the onus of bringing it forward. Signior Eduardo, are you in voice to-night?"

'"Donna Bianca, if you command it, I will be."

'"Then Signior, I lay on you my sovereign behest to furbish up your lungs and other vocal organs, as they will be wanted on my royal service."

'"Who would not be the Rizzio of so divine a Mary?"

'"A fig for Rizzio!" cried she, tossing her head with all its curls, as she moved to the piano. "It is my opinion the fiddler David must have been an insipid sort of fellow: I like Black Bothwell better: *to my mind a man is nothing without a spice of the devil in him;* and history may say what it will of James Hepburn, but I have a notion, he was just the sort of wild, fierce, bandit-hero, whom I could have consented to gift with my hand."

'"Gentlemen, you hear! Now which of you most resembles Bothwell?" cried Mr. Rochester.

* * * * * *

'"Here then is a corsair song. Know that I doat on corsairs; and for that reason, sing it *con spirito.*"

'"Commands from Miss Ingram's lips would put spirit into a mug of milk and water."

'"Take care, then: if you don't please me, I will shame you by showing how such things *should* be done."

'"That is offering a premium on incapacity: I shall now endeavour to fail."

'"*Gardez-vous en bien!* If you err wilfully, I shall devise a proportionate punishment."

'"Miss Ingram ought to be clement, for she has it in her power to inflict a chastisement beyond mortal endurance."

'"Ha! Explain!" commanded the lady.

'"Pardon me, madam: no need of explanation; your own fine sense must inform you that one of your frowns would be a sufficient substitute for capital punishment."'—Vol. ii. pp. 52—57.

The Novelist is now completely lord of the domain of Fiction. Whatever good or evil is to be done in the present day through that medium, must be done by him. He is the only dramatist whose plays can now command an audience. He is the only troubadour who finds admittance into the carpeted and cushioned halls of our modern chivalry, and arrests the ear of the lords and ladies of the nineteenth century. His work is the mirror of our life. It is the Odyssey and the Niebelungen Lied under a strange form: but still it is them indeed. Man's appetites do not change, nor his faculties, but only the external conditions under which they act; and the same appetites, the same faculties, which under one set of external conditions gave birth to Achilles, under another set give birth to Waverley or Pelham; who is to the reading gentleman what the son of Thetis was to the listening Greek—himself made perfect.

In the infancy of nations—in the age of bodily prowess, war, adventure, chivalry, when the mind is always turned outwards to great deeds and never inwards to itself, the Romance, be it in the prose form specifically so called, or in the ballad, or that higher form of ballad which is termed the Epic, holds undivided sway. The Iliad and Odyssey ought to be classed, not with the Æneid, Paradise Lost and the Henriade, but with Amadis de Gaul and the Cid. Virgil, Milton, and Voltaire have obscured the idea of the Epic, as the perfection of ballad poetry, by trying to write after the Epic model in an unepic age. The consequence of this error to themselves (a consequence which Virgil and Milton seem to have felt) is, that Virgil is redeemed from failure by certain non-epic passages, such as the history of Dido's love, and the splendid Inferno and Paradiso in the Sixth Book; Voltaire fails utterly; and Milton, thanks to that immortal force of genius which his original fault of judgment could not force from its true bent, produces a great spiritual poem—the poem of Puritanism.

To another age of civilization belongs the drama. This too has its time—a time which does not return. Homer's heroes hurl stones ten times as large as his audience could hurl; but his audience too hurled stones, or they would not have heard of it with interest. In Shakspeare's plays action may be ten times more intense and rapid, language ten times more vehement, and character ten times more marked than in the real men of his day; but still in the real men of his day action was intense and rapid, language was vehement, and character was marked. The Sidneys, Raleighs, and Southamptons saw in the heroes of the stage what they themselves aimed at being, and, in some measure, were. It was their own age which they saw imaged there, with all its grandeur and its grotesqueness, its free and swelling speech, its fierce and open passion, its strong and sudden hand. The wildest Utopia which the brain of an Idealist ever conceived, was only an exaggeration of the type of his own age. Plato's Republic is but a Greek polity after all. And so, we may be sure, the eye of the great poet, when rolling in its finest phrensy, saw the men of his own day, though he saw them through and through, to the very core of their humanity, and therefore was the poet of all ages while he was the dramatist of one. The essence of the drama is the development of character through action. When character is no longer developed in action—that is in visible action—the drama ceases. And that is the case in the period of civilization at which we are now arrived. You can no longer tell what a man is by what you see him do. The essence of action is driven inward; and what little does remain outward and visible, so as to be available for the purposes of the drama, is spread over so wide an expanse of mere conventionality and commonplace, that it cannot be eliminated and presented with dramatic rapidity without outraging all sense of probability. The perpetual tendency of civilization is to rub down all that is salient and prominent—all that of which the dramatist takes hold. The life of an individual of the higher classes in the present day is a perpetual εἰρωνεία—a polite dissimulation. Good breeding prevents the transpiration of character in manner; and language is seldom used to reveal the heart, though scoundrels only use it to conceal their thoughts. You might as well produce your hero on the stage in a state of physical nudity, as in the state of moral nudity which the drama requires. The spectre of Clio does indeed still walk the earth. We have tragedies of two kinds—the intolerable, which are meant to be acted, and the tolerable, which are not meant to be acted, but only read; that is, undramatic dramas—poems on moral subjects thrown into the form of dialogue and divided into acts and scenes. Three of this latter kind stand distinguished by acknowledged merit—'Edwin the Fair,' 'Philip van Artevelde,' and Mr. Kingsley's 'Saint's Tragedy.' In all these the scene is laid really—not formally only, as in the case of many of the plays of Shakspeare—in a far distant age: and in all, the thing principally aimed at and effected is not so much the development of character by action, as the embodiment of one predominent idea—an idea suggested in the case of 'The Saint's Tragedy,' and perhaps in that of 'Edwin the Fair' also, by the theological controversies of our day, and which the poet takes occasion to express as it were from a vantage ground and with an appearance of impartiality, by putting it into the lips of other men, and throwing it back into other times. 'Philip van Artevelde' is but an expansion of the simple moral of Wordsworth's Dion:

> 'Him only pleasure leads and peace attends,
> Him, only him, the shield of Jove defends,
> Whose means are fair and spotless as his ends.'

And each of these three productions has something in it essentially artificial and unreal. They are beautiful dramatic exercises—no more the genuine and spontaneous growth of the present age than any copy of Greek or Latin verses.

Comedy shows more life. But it is not the comedy of Shakspeare—the counterpart of tragedy—the embodiment of the humorous and grotesque. *That* appears no more in its proper shape, except when its spectre is raised by Mr. Taylor and Mr. Kingsley. The comedy which does keep possession of the stage, is the comedy of manners, of the witty and the ridiculous. No other is any longer credible. A Falstaff or a Malvolio has become an impossible monster. The tailor and the schoolmaster, and the restraints and influences of polite society, have made your fool, in all external things, very difficult to distinguish from your hero.

Still the spirit lives, though the form has passed away. The ground once covered by the Epic and the Drama is now occupied by the multiform and multitudinous Novel in all its various phases, from 'Ellen Middleton' to 'Pickwick.' That is to say, the novel has absorbed the strictly dramatic and epic element; for the lyric element which the Drama and Epic held, as it were, in solution, is concentrated and crystallized under another form. We use the word 'lyric' for want of a better, to include all poetry not narrative, descriptive, dramatic, or didactic—all the poetry of abstract feeling, sentiment, passion; without any reference to the 'lyres' and 'wires' with which such poetry, or a large division of it, was once associated, and of which it still, unfortunately, babbles. Byron presents disembodied and in its essence the life which Bulwer has embodied in Pelham and Ernest Maltravers; and the antagonists of Byron in poetry stand in a similar relation to the antagonists of Bulwer in prose. All those difficulties which oppose themselves with insuperable force to any attempt to epicize or dramatize the life of one day, the novelist, by means of his peculiar privileges and immunities, completely overcomes. Those long threads of commonplace doing and suffering which now make up the web of the most varied and eventful existence—which it is impossible to ignore, because, taken together, they are everything—impossible to narrate, because in their particulars they are mean—impossible to exhibit on the stage, because their length and complexity is infinite—are summed up and reduced to unity and significance. Between the rapidity and intensity of real and fictitious action a proportion is preserved, and the sense of probability is not outraged. The essence of action is followed into the recesses of the heart, without the fatal necessity of perpetual soliloquies and 'asides.' The gesture which would be indescribable in the epic, and invisible or unmeaning on the stage, is to the reader described, made visible, and rendered significant, by the exercise of an unlimited power of interpretation. The want of outward symbols and drapery is completely supplied by moral description; the integuments of social form and etiquette are stripped off, and we see that the tragic and the comic, the heroic and the base, the Hamlet and the Polonius, the Achilles and the Thersites, have not departed from life, but are only hidden from the eye—that it is true, as Carlyle says, that there is the fifth act of a tragedy in every peasant's death-bed, if you can only get it on the stage. The curtain of the novelist rises. The scene is a drawing room, where all the company are dressed alike; all have been drilled into a sort of Prussian discipline of manners, and a marked trait of character scarcely escapes once an hour. The worst dressed man there is perhaps the man of rank, the best dressed is the nobody. We penetrate at once through all the outworks of Stultz and Chesterfield into the depths of every breast—we know the royal nature from the slavish, the hero from the knave. The grouping of the guests, their conversation, their attention or inattention, their every look and gesture, has its true significance—a significance which no Garrick could impart. We discern the secret of the heart which causes a slight embarrassment of manner, a slight absence and wandering in discourse in the most polite and self-possessed of diners-out. We mark the plot or the intrigue which lurks in the arrangement of the party round the dinner table. We hear the bitter or passionate things which are said in soft words and with calm faces. The noise of the piano hides nothing from us. We know that the faint sigh which good breeding hushes on the lip would be, but for good breeding, an Othello's groan. We see that the empty coffee cup is raised to the lip to conceal a smile of triumph, or the face buried in a book of prints to hide the pallor of despair. In this respect, indeed, the Novel has the advantage of the Drama, not only with reference to the necessities imposed by its particular subject matter, but in the abstract. When Johnson objects to Iago's long soliloquy, that he is telling himself what he knows already, he is guilty of almost as great a platitude as in saying, that 'had the scene of Othello opened in Cyprus, and the preceding incidents been occasionally related, *there had been little wanting to a Drama of the most exact and scrupulous regularity!*' Iago is not telling himself anything; he is telling his audience what is passing through his mind. It is necessary to do so in order to give them a clue to his designs; but it is an awkward necessity, and one with which the genius of Shakspeare alone has dealt successfully.

Our object in this somewhat rambling digression has been to show what responsibility rests upon the novelists of our day—a reflection which we beg to suggest to the authoress of Jane Eyre. With them it rests to determine, each for himself and according to the measure of his gifts, whether so powerful an instrument of moving men, as fiction is, shall be used to move them for good or evil. Are the poetic and artistic faculties given to man purely for his amusement? Are they alone of all his powers not subject in their exercise to the legislative or judicial conscience. Curiously enough, we believe no moral philosopher has yet given a complete scientific answer to this question. A philosophical account of that part of man's essence which is neither moral nor intellectual, but lies midway between the two, both in itself and in its relation to the moral and intellectual parts, would we believe still be an addition to Moral Science. Neither in the fragments which remain to us of the Poetics, nor in the psychology of the Sixth Book of the Ethics, can Aristotle be said to have approached this subject. Plato in his Republic makes the same mistake regarding poetry which he makes with regard to rhetoric in the Gorgias—the same with the Patristic writer who calls poetry 'vinum dæmonum'—that of confounding the faculty with its abuse—and the beautiful *amende* of the Ion, though it vindicates his instincts, does not mend his system. However this may be, the position that the poetic and artistic faculties are subject to conscience, is a truism in theory which seems to be metamorphosed into a paradox in practice. We suppose, for example, that Mrs. Marcet considered herself to be uttering an acknowledged truth in saying that Goldsmith's 'Deserted Village,' being poetry, is none the worse for being bad political economy. Yet if this is so, neither is Don Juan, being also poetry, the worse for being bad religion. Goldsmith intended, or at least he foresaw that the effect of his poem would be, to raise certain sentiments and impressions relative to certain social questions; and if those sentiments were morbid and those impressions wrong, his poem is as plainly vicious as the most rigorous scientific treatise, embodying the same fallacies, would have been. This may seem an exaggerated instance. It is an *experimentum crucis,* certainly—but where is the line of demarcation to be drawn? The rule of truth-telling is, to convey a right impression; and therefore, unless a poet is to be absolved from the rule of truth-telling, his sentiments, as distinguished from his facts, must all be true. Deny this, and the realms of poetry and fiction become, what poor Charles Lambe pretended to think they were, a sort of refuge from the sense of moral responsibility—a region where the speaker of lies or blasphemies does no harm and the hearer takes none—a place where the Omnipresent is not, beyond 'the uttermost parts of the sea,' to which the spirit of the Psalmist, borne on the wings of morning, fled in vain—a darkness which shall *not* be turned into day. We do not mean to say that the writer of fiction is called upon to play the part of the preacher or the theologian. Far from it. What he is called upon to do is to hold up a clear and faithful mirror to human nature—a mirror in which it shall see its good as good, its evil as evil. His pages must give back the true reflection of a world of which morality is the law, and into which Christianity has entered.

The tendency of English novelists seems happily to be at present in the right direction. Within the last fifteen years, common sense, at any rate, has achieved some victories in our literature. Shakspeare has shone forth again, and Byron labours in eclipse. No heads, we believe, but those of shopboys and farmers' daughters, are now in danger of being turned by Lytton Bulwer. *That* Upas tree is pretty well withered up by contempt and ridicule in this country, though it still flourishes with rank luxuriance in the congenial soil of France. Dumas, Sue, and George Sand are, indeed, read by us, as well as by their own countrymen; but then we read them for the story, and laugh at the sentiment, which a Frenchman swallows as the word of life. The belief that the pen of a west-end Adonis could regenerate society, without the tedious process of repentance and self-government, is passing away with the last great men of that heroic age which produced the National Gallery and the Reform Bill. The religion which teaches that to sin is the indifferent-best way to save your soul, and that to prostitution in the higher classes much will be forgiven, has day by day fewer symbolical writings and fewer prophets in the land. Whether another and a more fatal humbug may not succeed, and whether a certain phase of the religious novel may not prove that humbug, remains yet to be seen. But at present a better influence reigns in the whole world of fiction, poetry, and art; and everywhere men who work by the rules of sense and truth, the Christian architect and the Christian writer, are slowly gaining ground, and seem likely—unless their course is crossed by some convulsion of society such as the last month has taught us to consider possible—to make rubble of the chimney-potted Parthenon and waste paper of the Satanic novel.

What would be the fate of the authoress whose work we are now reviewing, should that happy consummation be brought to pass, must be considered as doubtful. To say that 'Jane Eyre' is positively immoral or antichristian, would be to do its writer an injustice. Still it wears a questionable aspect. The choice is still to be made, and he who should determine it aright would do literature and society some service. The authoress of 'Jane Eyre' will have power in her generation, whether she choose to exercise it for good or evil. She has depth and breadth of thought—she has something of that peculiar gift of genius, the faculty of discerning the wonderful in and through the commonplace—she has a painter's eye and hand—she has great satiric power, and, in spite of some exaggerated and morbid cynicism, a good fund of common sense. To this common sense we would appeal. Let her take care that while she detects and exposes humbug in other minds, she does not suffer it to gain dominion in her own. Let her take warning, if she will, from Mr. Thackeray, to whom she dedicates her second edition, whom she thinks 'the first social regenerator of the day,' and whose 'Greek-fire sarcasm' and 'levin-brand denunciation' she overwhelms with such extravagant panegyric. Let her mark how, while looking every where for 'Snobs' to denounce, he has himself fallen into one, and not the least vicious, phase of that very character which he denounces. Or let her seek a more signal and ominous example in the history of that far higher mind which, after demolishing innumerable 'shams,' has itself, for want of a real faith of its own, sunk into the mournfullest sham of all. Let her reconsider her preface, and see how conventional may be the denouncer of conventionality, how great an idol the iconoclast may leave unbroken in himself. Let her cease, if she can, to think of herself as Micaiah, and of society as Ahab. Let her be a little more trustful of the reality of human goodness, and a little less anxious to detect its alloy of evil. She will lose nothing in piquancy, and gain something in healthiness and truth. We shall look with some anxiety for that second effort which is proverbially decisive of a writer's talent, and which, in this case, will probably be decisive of the moral question also.

ART. V.—*Undesigned Coincidences in the Writings both of the Old and New Testament, an Argument of their Veracity, &c. By the Rev.* J. J. BLUNT, *B.D. Margaret Professor of Divinity.* London: J. W. Parker. 1847.

IT is a hard necessity that is imposed on the Christian Advocate and Hulsean Lecturer in the University of Cambridge by the terms of their foundation; and we cannot but fear that the duties of the latter, as at present performed, are greatly detrimental to the highest interests of the academic body. Our quarrel is not, of course, with the present lecturer, who is admirably qualified for the post, nor with the munificent founder of these liberally endowed offices, whose pious care for the integrity of the Church's faith is worthy of all commendation. Living at a time when infidelity was rife both in England and on the Continent, and when the full powers of some of the highest intellects of the day were unhappily directed against revealed truth, he fell into the very natural and pardonable error of believing that the strife once commenced must continue for centuries, and that the impugners of the Christian faith, among whom was enrolled such an array of diversified talent, would require still to be confronted by the ablest champions of orthodoxy, such as it was his anxious care to provide for all succeeding generations. Thus the 'learned and ingenious person,' who holds the office of Christian Advocate 'for a term not exceeding five or six years,' is bound 'to compose 'yearly, whilst in office, some proper and judicious answer or 'answers every year, to all such new and popular, or other cavils 'or objections against the Christian and revealed religion, or 'against the religion of nature, as may seem best or most 'proper to deserve or require an answer, whether the same be 'ancient or modern objections, but chiefly such as are most 'modern; and especially such as have appeared in the English 'language of late years against Christianity, and which may not 'seem to have received a full and sufficient answer.' His field is further restricted in a subsequent part of the will; for his answers are to be directed 'only against notorious infidels, 'whether atheists or deists, not descending to any particular 'controversies or sects among Christians themselves, except 'some new or dangerous error, either of superstition or enthusiasm, as of popery and methodism, either in opinion or 'practice shall prevail.' Such is the office of the Christian Advocate; but for fear his defence of the faith, endangered as it was still to be by hosts of adversaries, should prove alone unavailing to rescue it from jeopardy, the front of the Christian battle was further strengthened by 'the Hulsean Lecturer or Christian Preacher'—an annual office, though usually in practice biennial. His duty is, by the founder's will, to preach and to print twenty sermons in each year, the object of which is 'to show the evidence for revealed religion, or to explain 'some of the most difficult texts, or obscure parts of Holy 'Scripture—or both.'

Such was the provision made by Mr. Hulse, just seventy years since, for the maintenance of revealed truth in the University of Cambridge, against all cavils and objections of atheists, infidels, or heretics for ever. But happily for the University, and for the country, it came to pass that even before his intentions could be carried into effect, the necessity had well-nigh ceased: for not only had the impugners of revelation been signally defeated, and the whole tide of atheism and infidelity driven back, but the controversy had furnished the Church with weapons of proof against all future assailants, much more potent than were likely to be forged in a time of peace and security, which she wisely laid up in her armory, and in the use of which she required her children to be practised before they ventured to seek her Lord's commission for the office and work of the ministry. But it was obviously very undesirable to perpetuate the memory of bygone controversies by annual publications, and weekly sermons through six months in the year. It was a questionable advantage to the academic body to have served up to them exploded arguments of defeated sceptics, and to have the foundations of their faith shaken only to show how strong they were. Add to which, the 'ingenious person,' who held the appointment was oft-times sorely perplexed in his choice of an error to demolish. Driven to cater for blasphemies among the obscure pages of some unknown infidel writer, whose arguments had not received a sufficient answer simply because they were too contemptible to require one, he was little likely to gain much advantage himself, or to be of material benefit to others. Christian truth is far too sacred a subject on which to exercise the dialectic faculties; an atheist or infidel is in far too awful a position to serve as a mere foil and dummy on which to exhibit the skill or strength of a fencer or a pugilist. Besides, the spirit of controversy was sure to haunt the University pulpit, long after the demon of unbelief had been driven out; and if copious doses of Paley-and-water were administered Sunday by Sunday to listless boors in country villages, threadworn arguments far above the low level of their dull comprehensions, in proof of doctrines which they had neither the wit to understand nor the will to question, the ordinary or select preachers in the University pulpit were sure to bestow sufficient attention on the outworks of the Christian faith, without any special provision made by Mr. Hulse, or others, and without any great advantage to their audience, except, perhaps, to demonstrate to the luckless undergraduates in the galleries the great advantage of mastering their 'little-go' subjects, that they too, in their turn, might astonish an admiring congregation by a similar display on the same stage.

But the founder's will was explicit; and however the ordinary supply of authors or preachers was more than sufficient to counteract and defeat all opposition to the faith, yet the annual volume of the Christian Advocate, and the Twenty Sermons of the Lecturer, ever dealing with 'notorious infidels, whether atheists or deists,' were still to be continued through all time. It was like continuing a cannonade after the enemy's guns were silenced, and his stronghold surrendered; or rather like raking up the ashes of a heretic, in order to commit them to the flames, and disperse them to the winds of heaven, to spread their pestilential influence far and wide.

The result might have been anticipated. Productions of a very mediocre character have been inflicted on the patient University by the learned and ingenious persons who have succeeded in getting up some infidelity for the nonce. Jejune sermons, scarcely listened to, and never read, have been teeming from the pulpit and press for more than a quarter of a century. True, the Court of Chancery, in mere pity to the young men, (whom, as minors, it may naturally regard with feelings of tender affection—as wards), has ordered the number of Lectures to be reduced to eight; but those eight occupy the University pulpit on the afternoons of two of the most important months in the year, and stand in the way of subjects of far greater importance, or at least of far higher interest at present. We do not wish to undervalue the evidences of Christianity; we do not deny that they ought to form part of an University education, not merely for candidates for Holy Orders, but for all degrees and estates of students; but we do deeply regret that the young men who enter upon their University career in the October Term from year to year, should be entertained for the whole month with grave discussions of knotty points of theology to which they are for the most part, it is to be hoped, entire strangers, and for the consideration of which they are in no wise prepared. Surely it would be much more profitable to them to receive practical directions not unbecoming such a presence, for their protection against those numerous snares to which many are for the first time exposed, and for their guidance in their academic course, which must give a tone and colour to their whole future life.

But this golden opportunity of bending the tender twig in the right direction, of instilling Christian principles which might impart a durable character to the youth of England, is now wasted in worse than useless discussions, the chief result of which is to create doubts on points that were before-time matters of unquestioning faith, and to foster a captious, cavilling, controversial spirit—the 'disputandi pruritus, Ecclesiæ scabies.'

It is well that the Christian student in a Christian University should be taught to prove the authority of the Sacred Canon, and to discriminate between the canonical and apocryphal books, (although, as times are, there is more danger of his underrating the apocrypha than of the contrary extreme); but there is something of higher importance still; and that is, the formation of such habits, the selection of such friends, the cultivation of such studies, as may enable him to pass his University course uncorrupted, and to look back upon it without compunction, and as may fit him for the faithful discharge of those duties for which God's providence has designed him.

We have said nothing of the impropriety of devoting the season of Lent or Easter to subjects such as those which are to form the staple of the Hulsean Lectures, (the second month in the academic year assigned to that much enduring functionary is the month of April), for the grievance is more tolerable than that which has now been noticed. On the whole, then, it would appear that the University, in the present generation, is no great gainer by the munificence of Mr. Hulse; nor are we sure that the country is much the wiser for the lucubrations of the Christian Advocates. There seems to be a fatality among their publications. They never live. Like Jonah's gourd, 'they come up in a night, and perish in a night.' Few men out of the University know that there is such an office. Once, perhaps, in a half century, there may rise up a giant in theology, a *malleus hæreticorum*, who is so unfortunate as to find in the prolific soil of Germany a monster progeny of infidels against whom to direct his well-aimed blows; and a series of such publications as those of Dr. Mill 'On the application of the Pantheistic Principles to the Theory and Historic Criticism of the Gospels,' will live, as they deserve, long after the controversy which called them forth is forgotten; but, for the most part, the authors and their productions are consigned together to a well-merited, but inglorious oblivion, after having astonished a small circle for nine days, by curious discoveries in the field of Scripture criticism, or by treating the Divine discourses of our Lord as a piece of complicated mechanism—a process which involves the sublime and simple majesty of our Saviour's practical teaching in obscurity and seeming confusion, from which it is to be extricated by the aid of quaint, inexplicable, unintelligible diagrams, or synoptical tables, and not more lucid dissertations.

We have been led to these remarks by observing that the works of Professor Blunt, embodied in this volume, 'were all of them originally the substance of sermons delivered before the University, some in a course of Hulsean Lectures, others on various occasions.' Mr. Blunt's productions have, therefore, escaped the common fate of such publications; and, on the whole, they deserved to do so. Indeed, they are much better suited to form a volume of evidences—always subsidiary to other more substantial arguments—than for delivery in the University pulpit. It is astonishing how prevalent the monstrous notion has become, that the academic body requires a course of teaching which would be suitable to no other congregation of Christians in the land. It is often assumed that they are not to be treated as Christians, but as sceptics or infidels. Plain practical sermons, dealing with the eternal truths of Revelation, and deducing from Christian doctrines rules of a holy life, have happily superseded the cold and heathenish morality of Blair and his school, in our towns and villages; and the various orders and degrees of men among us, from the noble to the peasant, so long as they remain under any religious restraint, are reminded from week to week of the paramount importance of things unseen, and warned against the snares to which their various avocations expose them. This is now the idea of what parochial teaching ought to be. And are not the engrossing studies of our Universities equally dangerous, to those who pursue them with diligence—as it is the clear duty of the Christian student to do—with the cares and business and pleasures of the world? Covetousness is the form of idolatry to which the merchant is exposed—ἔμποροι γὰρ φιλοκερδέστατον γένος, as they were in S. Chrysostom's time,—but is there no idolatry of the intellect? Worldly carefulness is the peculiar snare of the poor; but are there no fascinations in science and literature to beguile the unwary scholar to his ruin? Of all men in the world, none need more constantly to be reminded of his true position in the world, and of the only worthy and legitimate end and object of mental cultivation, or he may become so absorbed in the pursuit of mere secular learning as to forget or to neglect the safeguards which alone can secure him from its evil influences.

What then can we hope when the University preachers, converting the pulpit into a professorial chair, the church into a lecture-room, pander to the vitiated appetites which it should be their aim to correct, by argumentative discourses on points of theology sometime controverted in the Christian Church?

The sarcasm ascribed to an aged functionary in one of our universities, might be well nigh justified by his experience, when he said—'I have attended the University sermons for fifty years, and I am a Christian yet!'

But bad as is the case at Cambridge, to which these remarks particularly apply, it is perhaps worse at the sister University, where a practice is said to prevail which cannot be too strongly reprobated. The Cambridge University preachers have at least so much sense of decency that they do not commonly court popularity with the dominant party, by quoting garbled extracts from the published writings of an obnoxious individual, that so they may ingratiate themselves with 'responsible governors,' in whose gift is the patronage. No doubt there are the same number of honest, earnest men in both universities, anxious 'to deliver their testimony' before those important assemblies; all the various modifications of sentiment tolerated in the Church find expression alike in both pulpits; and the whole scheme of Christian doctrine is compressed into the narrow limits of one sermon, by carpet-divines, with like frequency in both: but no Cambridge Professor is precluded from attending the University Sermon by the almost certain prospect of a personal attack from which he has no protection, or of an unjust censure from which lies no appeal. Long may it be before such personalities become the test of orthodoxy in the Cambridge University Pulpit!

But to return to the 'Undesigned Coincidences.' Their unsuitableness for the purposes of pulpit instruction—which is the first thought that occurs to the mind that can realise the monstrous fact that they were all of them delivered as sermons—cannot be justly charged on the author. He was Hulsean Lecturer, and there was no help for him. And although it is difficult to conceive that the 'Horæ Paulinæ' could by any manner of means be converted into sermons available for purposes of practical instruction, we yet hope that this may have been the case with Mr. Blunt's discourses, which he tells us have been divested of the form of sermons. Not but that there still remain some passages admirably adapted for the purpose which we apprehend a Christian preacher should ever propose to himself in handling inspired Scripture: viz. to make it 'profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction 'in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, 'throughly furnished unto all good works.'

The volume, however, invites criticism rather as an argument for the veracity of the Holy Scriptures, than as a collection of University sermons; and in this view we shall now regard it. The nature of the argument will be readily understood by those who are acquainted with the valuable work just mentioned. Mr. Blunt has extended to the whole Bible the argument of *undesigned coincidences*—applied with such masterly success by Paley to the vindication of the genuineness and authenticity of S. Paul's Epistles. But we deeply regret that in following out this design, the Professor has not had more regard to the improved tone of the age for which he writes. The phraseology of Dr. Paley, so offensive as it must needs be to a reverent mind, was scarcely justified by the circumstances of the times in which he lived, when it was judged expedient to meet the sceptics on their own ground, and to adopt the terms of their own assumptions in argument. It is most undesirable to perpetuate such phraseology; and if *undesigned coincidences* necessarily involve its use, it becomes a serious question whether Revelation does not lose more than it gains by the argument. The following passage, which is one of the mildest forms of that very offensive insinuation in which the volume abounds, will serve also to explain more clearly the design of the author.

'The general drift of our argument is this, that when we see 'the writers of the Scriptures *clearly telling the truth* in those 'cases where we have the means of *checking* their accounts,— 'when we see *that they are artless, consistent, veracious writers,* 'where we have the opportunity of examining the fact, it is '*reasonable to believe that they are telling the truth* in those cases 'where we have not the means of checking them,—that they are '*veracious* where we have not the means of putting them to 'proof.'—(P. 3.) The bare idea of imposture is so utterly abhorrent to reverential feelings, and so dangerous to an unstable mind, that it ought ever to be clothed in the most cautiously guarded language. Stated it must be, for the whole argument is based on the supposition, but it cannot be right to parade the inspired writers as possible 'impostors' (pp. 6, 34), or 'subtle contrivers' (p. 37), as dupes or enthusiasts, whose writings are possibly fictions (*e. g.* pp. 32, 34), however cleverly they may be afterwards freed from the imputation by proving the consistency of their narrative. An apologist for Revelation may surely controvert infidel objections without for a moment treating the Divine records as mere human compositions. There seems even to be a temporary oblivion of the inspiration of the Pentateuch, when it is said (p. 43), that Moses 'has *left himself open to misconstruction,* by the very '*unguarded and artless* manner in which he expresses himself, 'and has even placed the character of Jacob as an exclusive 'worshipper of the true God, *unintentionally in jeopardy*' (comp. pp. 47, 50, 51, 62, 74, 85). Not to multiply examples of this kind of violence done to the religious veneration of Christians by Professor Blunt, we must add that had he trusted more to the penetration of his readers, and left them, as he might safely have done, to deduce for themselves the consequences of the coincidences which he has pointed out, he would not have laid himself open to this grave charge, nor would his argument have lost any of its intrinsic value. It is entirely gratuitous to imagine 'the discovery of a fifth or sixth Gospel;' (p. 260,) and the irreverence is not corrected by an exhortation 'to apply 'ourselves diligently to comparing together the four witnesses 'which we have, instead of indulging a fruitless desire for more,' (p. 261,)—as though there were not some unfathomable mystery of heavenly import in these numbers, ordained from the beginning, as they were typified under the old dispensation:—a persuasion with which the mind of a true Catholic is so thoroughly imbued that he cannot contemplate the possibility of the catastrophe supposed in p. 314,—'Had the Gospel of 'St. John been the only portion of the New Testament which 'had descended to our times, and all record of the ascension 'perished.'

But we gladly turn from the contemplation of this unfavourable aspect of the volume before us, and forbear to comment on other instances of the same style. It is the fault, no doubt, of the school in which he studied the evidences of Christianity: and we have noticed it more by way of warning than of censure, being fully convinced of the mischievous tendency of such controversial writings, as would sacrifice in defence of the faith all that reverential awe for its sacred repository, which is its surest safeguard: while, as far as the individual is concerned, we cheerfully acquit the respected writer of all intentional irreverence.

The 'Undesigned Coincidences' are divided into four parts, coinciding with the several volumes in which this work originally appeared. They consist of:—'The Veracity of the Books of Moses,' 'The Veracity of the Historical Scriptures of the Old Testament,' and 'the Veracity of the Gospels and Acts, argued from undesigned coincidences to be found in them, when compared in their several parts; and, in the last instance, when compared also with the writings of Josephus.'—(Preface, p. v.)

We regret that we can speak with only qualified commendation of the performances of Professor Blunt in this department of Scripture criticism; but it must be said that a very large proportion of the coincidences are so evidently undesigned, that one is inclined to doubt their reality, even after they have been pointed out; others are mere fancies, often proceeding on false premises; while, of the really sound ones, many have been noticed by former commentators, and others, which are obvious to the most superficial reader, are set forth with a parade that is wholly superfluous.

We will adduce two examples from divisions of the volume.

No student, it is apprehended, can fail to remark in the book of Genesis certain indications of a regularly constituted Church, with a ritual and ceremonial suitable to the primitive simplicity of the world's infancy, traditional traces whereof may be discovered in the various forms of idolatry that by degrees superseded the worship of the true God. These 'scat-'tered and imperfect fragments (as it were) of the fabric of 'a patriarchal Church,' Professor Blunt has collected and arranged, and woven into an harmonious whole with characteristic ingenuity. But here, unhappily, in his zeal to accumulate proofs of a position which no intelligent person would be disposed to question, he has run counter to the received expositions of all catholic commentators in a passage of deep and mysterious import. Of the three angelic visitors that appeared to Abraham in the plain of Mamre, there was obviously One of surpassing dignity, to Whom the patriarch more immediately addresses himself, and Who renews in His own name the promise long since made to Abraham, and determines the exact time of its accomplishment. The names, the titles, and attributes given to this Angel, plainly mark Him as the Divine Word, afterwards incarnate for our redemption,—the Only-begotten Son, Who declared the invisible Father to the patriarchs and prophets of the earlier dispensations. Accordingly, when Abraham had brought his heavenly guests on their way toward the Cities of the Plain, and the LORD had declared to Abraham the thing which He was about to do, we read, 'The men turned their faces from thence, and went toward Sodom; but Abraham stood yet before the LORD.' The obvious conclusion from this narrative is, that the Divine Person with whom he was conversing, and with whom he interceded for the devoted city, still stood in bodily form before him, while the two angels passed on: and that this is a correct conclusion is proved by the arrival of the two angels at Sodom in the evening; and by the words (in verse 33), 'The LORD went on His way, as soon as He had left communing with Abraham.' But this sublime and awful view of the intercession is completely lost sight of by Mr. Blunt, who adduces the expressions which relate to a personal, visible presence of Deity, in proof of a consecrated locality, 'where prayer was wont to be made.'—P. 9.

In a subsequent passage, where he seems to take a truer view of this particular point, he is very unhappy in the coincidence which he finds between Abraham's intercession for Sodom, and his kinsman's sojourn in that city; as though it were not obvious to a child, that his affection for Lot was the chief motive to that earnest plea in behalf of the city where he dwelt; and the remark that 'the whole (xviiith) chapter might be read 'without our gathering from it a single hint that he had any 'relative within ten days' journey of the place,' is simply unmeaning, when we remember the prominence that is given to the fact in an earlier part of the patriarch's history, (chap. xiii. xiv.) and in the chapter immediately following.

To return to the reconstructed Church of the patriarchs. We abstain from assailing other weak points in the argument, which are many; and would rather notice with commendation the very beautiful manner in which the author has exhibited the *types* of that primitive dispensation. They have no claim perhaps to the merit of originality, as the readers of Warburton will know, but they are well and forcibly put. Having adduced proofs (some very fanciful and far-fetched) of '*places* set apart 'for worship; *persons* to officiate; a decent *ceremonial;* an 'appointed *season* for holy things; and of the *duties* and *doctrines* 'which were taught in that ancient Church,' (p. 23); of 'sacrifices and sacraments,'—he thus proceeds (p. 25):—

> 'Then, as she had her *sacrifices* and *sacraments*, so had she her *types*,—types which in number scarcely yield to those of the Levitical law, in precision and interest, perhaps, exceed them. For we meet with them in the names and fortunes of individuals whom the Almighty Disposer of events, without doing violence to the natural order of things, exhibits as pages of a *living* book, in which the Promise is to be read—as characters expressing His counsels and covenants writ by His own finger—as actors, whereby he upholds to a world, not yet prepared for less gross and sensible impressions, scenes to come. It would lead me far beyond the limits of my argument were I to touch upon the multitude of instances, which will crowd, however, I doubt not, upon the minds of my readers. I might tell of Adam, whom St. Paul himself calls "the figure" or type "of Him that was to come,"—(Rom. v. 14; 1 Cor. xv. 45). I might tell of the sacrifice of Isaac, (though not altogether after him whose vision upon this subject, always bright, though often baseless, would alone have immortalized his name)—of that Isaac, whose birth was preceded by an annunciation to his mother (Gen. xviii. 10), whose conception was miraculous (Gen. xviii. 14); who was named of the angel before he was conceived in the womb (Gen. xvii. 19), and Joy, or Laughter, or Rejoicing was that name (Gen. xxi. 6); who was, in its primary sense, the seed in which all the nations of the earth were to be blessed (Gen. xxii. 18); whose projected death was a rehearsal, as it were, almost two thousand years beforehand, of the great offering of all. The very mountain, Moriah, not chosen by chance, not chosen for convenience, for it was three days' journey from Abraham's dwelling-place, but no doubt appointed of God as the future scene of a Saviour's passion too; (Gen. xxii. 2; 2 Chron. iii. 1.) A son, an only son, the victim; the very instrument of the oblation, the *wood*, not carried by the young men, not carried by the ass which they had brought with them, but laid on the shoulders of him that was to die, as the cross was borne up that same ascent by Him who, in the fulness of time, was

'should appear,' says Mr. Blunt, 'that Laish, though far from 'Sidon, was in early times a town belonging to Sidon, and 'probably inhabited by Sidonians; for it was *after their manner* 'that the people lived;' (p. 112). Now we accept this gloss; it is far from original. Indeed the fact appears very obvious, when taken in connexion with a subsequent remark of the sacred historian, in narrating the sack of Laish by the Danites; 'there was no deliverer, because it was far from Sidon;' (ver. 28.) But the 'very curious geographical coincidence' which the Professor has discovered in a passage of Deuteronomy, is mere fancy. Laish was situated at the foot of Mount Hermon, '*which Hermon the Sidonians call Sirion*, and the Amorites 'call it Shenir.' (Deut. iii. 9.) The Sidonian name of the mountain is accounted for by the Sidonian colony at its foot; and a parade is made of the inferences and deductions by which we arrive at this conclusion; as though there was anything strange in a remarkable mountain having two distinct names among two people, to either of whom it was a conspicuous object, as Hermon must ever have been equally to the Sidonians and the Amorites. We fully agree with Mr. Blunt, that 'the geography of Canaan, owing to its extreme perplexity,'—if it be not rather owing to our extreme ignorance,—'scarcely 'furnishes its due contingent to the argument which he is 'handling;' (p. 116.) The minute particularity, and the strict consistency of the numerous geographical details interspersed among the writings of the Old Testament, might prove, in competent hands, a valuable argument for the authenticity of those writings against the mythical theory of Ewald and his school; and on this account any unsuccessful attempts to apply them to this purpose are the more to be regretted, as tending to bring discredit on that kind of argument. We have adduced but one of many such attempts and failures, in this Volume.

But we pass on to what must be regarded as in every respect the happiest application of that branch of criticism in which our author's ingenuity appears to take especial delight. We allude to the history of David, in his notices of which there is comparatively little to offend, and very much to interest and edify. Had the whole volume of coincidences been modelled after this type, we should have been able to speak of it with almost unqualified approbation; we should not even have considered the subject inappropriate for a course of sermons; for here the Lecturer is, for the most part, eminently practical; and his whole style is well suited to such an audience as the University preacher has to address.

The following coincidence (No. vi.) is interesting. It relates to the provision made by David for the safety of his parents during the time that his life was threatened by the malicious jealousy of Saul.

> 'And David,' we read, 'went thence to Mizpeh of *Moab;* and he said unto the King of *Moab,* Let my father and my mother, I pray thee, come forth, and be with you till I know what God will do for me. And he brought them before the King of Moab; and they dwelt with him all the time that David continued in the hold.' (1 Samuel xxii. 3. 4.)
>
> Now what principle of preference may be imagined to have governed David when he committed his family to the dangerous keeping of the Moabites? Was it a mere matter of chance? It might seem so, so far as appears to the contrary in David's history, given in the books of Samuel; and if the book of Ruth had never come down to us, to accident it probably would have been ascribed. But this short and beautiful historical document shows us a *propriety* in the selection of Moab above any other for a place of refuge to the father and mother of David; since it is there seen, that the grandmother of Jesse, David's father, was actually a *Moabitess,* Ruth being the mother of Obed, and Obed the father of Jesse. (Ruth iv. 17.) And, moreover, that Orpah, the other Moabitess, who married Mahlon at the time when Ruth married Chilion his brother, remained behind in Moab after the departure of Naomi and Ruth, and remained behind with a strong feeling of affection, nevertheless, for the family and kindred of her deceased husband, taking leave of them with tears. (Ruth i. 14.) She, herself, then, or, at all events, her descendants and friends, might still be alive. Some regard for the posterity of Ruth, David would persuade himself, might still survive amongst them. An interval of fifty years, for it probably was not more, was not likely, he might think, to have worn out the memory and the feelings of the relationship, in a country and at a period which acknowledged the ties of family to be long and strong, and the blood to be the life thereof.'—P. 127.

The next instance on which we have to remark is not so successful. (No. ix.) It is an attempt to account for the treachery of Ahithophel, and the part he took in the insurrection of Absalom, by his relationship to Bathsheba; for it seems to be satisfactorily made out by a comparison of 2 Samuel xxiii. 34 with xi. 3, that the wife of Uriah was the granddaughter of the conspirator. Having discovered this, (though it has been noticed by earlier writers,) Mr. Blunt proceeds:—'I feel that 'now I have the key to the conduct of this leading conspirator; 'the sage and prudent friend of David converted by some 'means or other into his deadly foe; for I now perceive that 'when David murdered Uriah, he murdered Ahithophel's *grandson* by marriage, and when he corrupted Bathsheba he corrupted his *granddaughter* by blood. Well, then, after this 'disaster and dishonour of his house, might revenge rankle 'in the heart of Ahithophel;' &c.—P. 142.

The writer seems most unaccountably to forget the long interval that had elapsed between the two events—an interval of ten or twelve years at the least—in which time the relations between David and the house of Ahithophel had undergone so great a change, that *David* was now Ahithophel's *grandson* by marriage, and David's queen was his *granddaughter* by blood. Surely, in the eyes of a man so utterly unprincipled as Ahithophel proved himself to be, the dignity conferred upon his family by this close connexion with the throne, to which his great grandson Solomon was long since designated successor, would more than compensate for all past dishonour; and we can imagine none but the lowest motives of self-aggrandizement that could induce him to join the conspiracy, and thereby disturb the succession to the throne, which had been secured to his house. Indeed, it would seem to be so far from true that Ahithophel's affections were alienated from David by the dishonour of Bathsheba, that it is much more likely that their friendship, and even acquaintance, commenced subsequently to that event. For while it is highly improbable that David could be wholly unacquainted with the granddaughter of his intimate friend and counsellor, (2 Sam. xi. 3,) nothing was more natural than that he should take the grandfather of his queen into his confidence, and avail himself of his experience. Had the relationship of Ahithophel been traced to Uriah, the argument might have had some weight; as it is, we are persuaded the coincidence is purely imaginary.

The next example (No. x.) is perhaps the most satisfactory in the volume, and we will not quarrel with it, because many of its points cannot fail to strike any attentive reader of the narrative. It involves a deep moral, which is well and forcibly applied. The despotic control that Joab had established over David, and which he exercised with such complete security, although it broke out frequently into acts of outrageous violence, and manifested itself in flagrant disobedience and undissembled insolence, until it finally resulted in overt rebellion in the conspiracy of Adonijah, was based, no doubt, on his participation in the guilt of Uriah's murder, to which he was instigated by the king's command. That one act of obedience for ever emancipated the captain of the host from all restraint of duty, or loyalty, or respect. From thenceforth his own will was his law; and the rule of his own unbridled passions, his measure of obedience. It was perhaps to David the heaviest part of the curse that still followed the sin—though repented of and remitted—that it gave licence, as it were, to Joab to sin with impunity; for how could the king punish the murderer who had once become so on his suggestion? The sword of justice was powerless in his hand when he should have directed it against Joab; for 'when *David made him the partner and 'secret agent of his guilty purpose touching Uriah, he sold himself 'into his hands;* in that fatal letter he sealed away his liberty, 'and surrendered it up to his unscrupulous accomplice.' (p. 145.)

After tracing the gradual rise of David's fortunes until his establishment on the throne of Israel, and the authority which he had exercised over Joab in Hebron, on occasion of the murder of Abner, the Lecturer thus proceeds to the contrast:—

> 'Whoever will peruse the eighth and tenth chapters of the second Book of Samuel, in which are recorded the noble achievements of David at this bright period of his life, his power abroad and his policy at home, the energy which he threw into the national character, and the respect which he commanded for it throughout all the East, will perceive that he reigned without a restraint and without a rival. Now comes the guilty act; the fatal stumbling-block against which he dashed his foot, and fell so pernicious a height. And henceforward I see, or imagine I see, Joab usurping by degrees an authority which he had not before; taking upon himself too much; executing or disregarding David's orders, as it suited his own convenience; and finally conspiring against his throne and the rightful succession of his line. Again: I perceive, if I mistake not, the hands of David tied; his efforts to disembarrass himself of his oppressor feeble and ineffectual; his resentment set at nought; his punishments, though just, resisted by his own subject, and successfully resisted. For I find Joab suggesting to David the recall of Absalom after his banishment, through the widow of Tekoah, in a manner to excite the suspicion of the king. (2 Sam. xiv. 19.) "Is not the hand of Joab with thee in all this?" were the words, in which probably more was meant than met the ear.'—Pp. 146, 147.

Then, after digressing to notice David's parental affection towards his rebellious son, he proceeds:—

> 'So these last instructions to his officers touching the safety of Absalom, even when he was in arms against him, are still uttered in the same spirit; a spirit which seems, even at this moment, far more engrossed with the care of his child than with the event of his battle. "Deal gently for my sake with Absalom." Joab heard, indeed, but heeded not; he had lost all reverence for the king's commands; nothing could be more deliberate than his infraction of this one, probably the most imperative which had ever been laid upon him. It was not in the fury of the fight that he forgot the commission of mercy, and cut down the young man with whom he was importuned to deal tenderly; but as he was hanging in a tree, helpless and hopeless; himself directed to the spot by the steps of another; in cold blood; but remembering, perhaps, his barley, and more of which we know not, and caring nothing for the king whose *guilty secret he had shared*, he thrust him through the heart with his three darts, and then made his way, with countenance unabashed, into the chamber of his royal master, where he was weeping and mourning for Absalom. The bitterness of death must have been nothing to David, compared with the feelings of that hour, when his conscience smote him (as it doubtless did) with the complicated trouble and humiliation into which his deed of lust and blood had thus sunk him down. The rebellion itself, the fruit of it (as I hold); the audacious disobedience of Joab to the moving entreaties of the parent, that his favourite son's life might be spared, rebel as he was, felt to be the fruit of that sin too; for by that sin it was that he had delivered himself and his character, bound hand and foot, to the tender mercies of Joab, who had no touch of pity in him. The sequel is of a piece with the opening: Joab imperious, and David, the once high-minded David, abject in spirit and tame to the lash. "Thou hast shamed this day the face of all thy servants. Arise, go forth, and speak comfortably to thy servants; for I swear by the Lord, if

thou go not forth, there will not tarry one with thee this night, and that will be worse unto thee than all the evil that befel thee from thy youth up until now." (2 Sam. xix. 7.) The passive king yields to the menace, for what can he do? and with a cheerful countenance and a broken heart, obeys the commands of his subject, and sits in the gate. But this is not all. David now sends a message to Amasa, a kinsman whom Absalom had set over his rebel army; it is a proposal, perhaps a secret proposal, to make him captain over his host in the room of Joab. The measure might be dictated at once by policy, Amasa being now the leader of a powerful party whom David had to win, and by disgust at the recent perfidy of Joab, and a determination to break away from him at whatever cost. Amasa accepts the offer; but in the very first military enterprise on which he is despatched, Joab accosts him with the friendly salutation of the East, and availing himself of the unguarded moment, draws a sword from under his garment, smites him under the fifth rib, and leaves him a bloody corpse in the highway. Then he calmly takes upon himself to execute the commission with which Amasa had been charged; and this done, "he returns to Jerusalem," we read, "unto the king," and once more he is "over all the host of Israel." '—Pp. 148—150.

Then follows the revolt of Adonijah, in which Joab is conspicuous among the conspirators; but still David is powerless, and leaves to Solomon the task of avenging all the evil deeds which that man of blood had committed; and 'it is remarkable 'that this formidable traitor, from whose thraldom David, in 'the flower of his age, and the splendour of his military renown, 'could never disengage himself, fell at once before the arm of 'Solomon, a stripling, if not a beardless boy.' The cause of this, and the moral to be deduced from the whole narrative, we give at length:—

'But Solomon had as yet a clear conscience, which David had forfeited with respect to Joab; this it was that armed the youth with a moral courage which his father had once known what it was to have, when he went forth as a shepherd-boy against Goliath, and which he afterwards knew what it was to want, when he crouched before Joab, as a king. So true it is, the "wicked flee when no man pursueth, but the righteous is bold as a lion."

'And now can any say that God winked at this wickedness of his servant? That the man after his own heart—for such in the main he was, frail as he proved himself—sinned grievously, and sinned with impunity? On the contrary, this deed was the pivot upon which David's fortunes turned; that done, and he was undone; then did God raise up enemies against him for it out of his own house, for "the thing," as we are expressly told, "displeased the Lord;" (2 Sam. xi. 27; xii. 11;) thenceforward the days of his years became full of evil; and if he lived, (for the Lord *caused death to pass* from himself to the child, by a vicarious dispensation,—2 Sam. xii. 13,) it was to be a king, with more than kingly sorrows, but with little of kingly power; to be banished by his son; bearded by his servant; betrayed by his friends; deserted by his people; bereaved of his children; and to feel all, all these bitter griefs, bound, as it were, by a chain of complicated cause and effect, to this one great original transgression. This was surely no escape from the penalty of his crime, though it was still granted him to live and breathe. God would not slay even Cain, nor suffer others to slay him, whose punishment, nevertheless, was greater than he could bear; but rather it was a lesson to him and to us, how dreadful a thing it is to tempt the Almighty to let loose his plagues upon us, and how true is he to his word, "Vengeance is mine, and I will repay, saith the Lord."

'Meanwhile, by means of the fall of David, however it may have caused some to blaspheme, God may have also provided, in his mercy, that many since David should stand upright; the frailty of one may have prevented the miscarriage of thousands; saints, with his example before their eyes, may have learned to walk humbly, and so to walk surely, when they might otherwise have presumed and perished; and sinners, even the men of the darkest and most deadly sins, may have been saved from utter desperation and self-abandonment, by remembering David and all his trouble; and that, deep as he was in guilt, he was not so deep but that his bitter cries for mercy, under the remorse and anguish of his spirit, could even yet pierce the ear of an offended God, and move him to put away his sin.'—Pp. 151—153.

We are sorry that we cannot proceed in a tone of commendation; but the two next instances of fancied coincidence are based on an error that appears at intervals throughout the volume, and imperatively calls for correction.

Mr. Blunt has very justly remarked, (p. 116,) 'that the 'manifold instances in which different places are called by the 'same name in the Holy Land . . . . accords very singularly 'with the circumstances under which Scripture reports the land 'of Canaan to have been occupied; viz., that it was divided 'amongst twelve tribes of one and the same nation.' The knowledge of this fact ought to have prevented him from supposing (No. xi. pp. 153—155) that there was any difficulty in a '*wood of Ephraim*' (2 Sam. xviii. 6) existing in the land of Gilead, which it was necessary to account for by the battle between the Ephraimites and Gileadites recorded in the Book of Judges, (chap. xii.) Surely this is to create difficulties, in order to show how cleverly they can be surmounted. It is certainly just possible that the conjecture may be well founded, and therefore it were tolerable if offered in the form of a suggestion; but it is provokingly valueless as a link in the chain of evidence, and ought not to have been adduced; for not only does the frequent recurrence of identical proper names in various districts of the Holy Land, but the additional fact that the Hebrew proper names are mostly also appellatives, render such arguments delusive, without a far larger number of well ascertained geographical data than are at present within our reach.

The same remarks will apply with at least equal force to the names of persons; and to proceed upon the hypothesis that identity of name is any token of personal identity, must involve endless difficulties. In 2 Sam. xix. 37, 38, Barzillai the aged Gileadite recommends his son Chimham to David's protection. After an interval of nearly five centuries we have incidental mention of a 'habitation of Chimham, which is by Bethlehem.' (Jerem. xli. 17.) 'What can be more probable,' asks Mr. Blunt, 'than that David the Bethlehemite should have bestowed his patri'mony, in whole or in part, on Chimham, which had remained 'in his family ever since?' (No. xii. p. 157). Again, it is just possible that it may have been so, but it is much more probable that there is no connexion at all between the two passages. For, supposing David to have inherited an estate near Bethlehem, it was at best only the portion of the youngest brother in a poor family of eight children, so that the 'flattering reward' could have had little intrinsic value. It was 'a personal, as well as a royal mark of favour,' unworthy, equally in either view, of the important services which Barzillai had rendered him in the extremity of his distress. Besides which, the prohibitions contained, and the provisions made in the law (*e. g.* Numb. xxxvi.) against the alienation of an inheritance from the tribe in which it was locally situated would effectually have prevented the righteous king from conveying to a man of the tribe of Manasseh an estate in the territory of Judah, however he might have been otherwise disposed to do so. And, lastly, it would seem probable that the 'habitation of Chimham, which is by Bethlehem,' derived its name from some individual then in occupation of the house; and if not, it is unlikely that the family of Chimham the son of Barzillai should have retained possession for five centuries, amid so many political convulsions, and so many foreign invasions. At least it must not be taken for granted, and stated as a point of coincidence.

But we are quite tired of finding fault with a writer whom we regard with so much esteem as Professor Blunt. We will, therefore, only further notice his treatment of Mephibosheth, the lame son of Jonathan, the son of Saul. (No. xiv. p. 164—169.) He has offered great violence to our sympathies, and, what is much more serious, he has done, we are convinced, great injustice to an estimable character, in representing Mephibosheth in so unfavourable a light, as the very counterpart in fact of his rascally servant Ziba. The palpable duplicity and self-seeking of the slanderous Ziba is questioned or palliated; the excuse of his master is dismissed with the somewhat flippant remark, that 'the tale appears to be as lame as the tale-bearer;' and the generous devotion which led him to despise his worldly possession, and to relinquish all to the convicted slanderer, satisfied with this, that the king who was to him as an angel of God had come again to his own house in peace,—all this is passed over without notice, as so much insincere profession of attachment to his benefactor, against whom he had been plotting with a view to bring back the kingdom to the house of his fathers.

Surely his unwashed clothes and his untrimmed beard—not ostentatiously paraded by himself, as Mr. Blunt would imply, but mentioned by the sacred historian as positive indications of his poignant sorrow, ought to have preserved his memory from such an imputation. His is a hard fate indeed to be exposed to new slanders, thousands of years after his death. And all, for what? To account for the omission of his name in David's last instructions to his son Solomon, as though there were no other possible account to be given of this silence: as if, *e. g.*, after the extinction of Saul's family to expiate the slaughter of the Gibeonites, the paternal inheritance of Mephibosheth may not have rendered him independent of royal bounty; or David may have provided for him sufficiently during his own life-time; or he may have been removed by death, beyond reach of fresh favours.

We own to a strong suspicion of new discoveries of this kind in Holy Scripture, especially when they would lead us to regard in an unfavourable point of view characters which we have learnt to esteem. We are satisfied with the common estimate of Mephibosheth; and it is no recommendation of Mr. Blunt's view that it is new. It is not necessary to defend David against the charges of injustice and oblivion of his oath, by accusing Mephibosheth of deception and rebellion, aggravated by perjury and gross ingratitude. The records of David's reign contain quite a sufficient element of vice on the surface: no need to blacken those few characters of whom we are permitted to think more favourably.

But we have said more than enough to show the character of Professor Blunt's volume, of its merits and faults. The remaining parts exhibit the same admixture, and in almost the same proportions, as the two former parts which have here been noticed; and the errors in the later parts are ascribable to the same weakness to which the earlier ones have been traced. An over anxiety to multiply illustrations of his argument leads him to discover cases of coincidence where none really exist; and history, geography and chronology are unconsciously distorted in order to contribute additional instances. The bare enumeration of examples under the three classes into which they would naturally fall—good, bad, and indifferent—would swell this review beyond its due limits, which it has, perhaps, already exceeded; and we can, after all, most conscientiously recommend the work to the perusal of the Biblical student: the very test that he must apply to every section, will prove to him a useful exercise in the field of Scripture criticism.

But the main value of the Professor's volume, if we mistake not, consists in this, that it gives a reality to the sacred narrative; invests historical facts and personages with new interest; and almost animates them with new life. The events of sacred history are commonly, from some cause or other, less clearly realized than those of civil history;—not because the imagery is less vividly drawn, or the facts less faithfully detailed, or the circumstances of inferior interest; but probably because the peculiarities of Oriental customs, diction, style, (with which we mostly become familiar through the medium of the Arabian Nights, or other equally veracious 'Entertainments,') throw over all a halo of romance, which produces a kind of vague impression such as the parables leave on the mind of a child. In fact, the outlines require to be strengthened, in order that we may think and judge of men and things as they really were. Familiarity with the manners and customs of the East, so much less liable to change than our own,—such a familiarity as could alone be acquired by travel, or rather by a residence in Syria, would of course be the best and surest method of supplying the desideratum. But, 'non cuivis homini contingit:' The few who have the opportunity are much to be envied; and they are laid under a strong obligation to observe carefully and report faithfully, without disparagement on the one hand or exaggeration on the other, whatever may serve to the elucidation of Scripture truth; for the great majority of Christians must of necessity look to books for information on the subject, and the more familiar we become with the geography and scenery of Palestine, and with the habits of native life, the juster conceptions we shall form of the public or private events recorded in the Inspired Books. We shall thus learn to regard the Patriarchs, Prophets and Apostles as men 'subject to like passions as we are;' they will no longer be the dim ideal beings that they are to most of us; unsubstantial, phantom-like forms flitting over the page of sacred history like painted figures on the illuminated disc of a magic lantern. Now it is because Professor Blunt thus deals with the sacred history, reasoning about men and things as of substantial realities—yet for the most part without any irreverent familiarity—that his book is calculated to be eminently useful; just as Paley's Horæ Paulinæ, from which the idea is borrowed, has a use quite independent of that which its author contemplated—independent, that is, of the argument—namely, that it directs our attention to those features which mark the Apostolic writings as real epistolary communications with the various Churches; and by helping us to interweave the letters with the history, reflects light on both; so that the history enables us to understand allusions in the letters, which were obscure or inexplicable of themselves, while on the other hand, the letters fill up gaps in the history, and furnish a commentary of the utmost value on various passages in the Apostle's life; insomuch that the Christian student looks back upon his first acquaintance with that masterly work as an era that opened to his enjoyment, not merely fresh stores of sound criticism, but—what is of infinitely higher value—untold treasures of Divine wisdom, in the example and experience of the great Apostle, which were before hidden from his eyes. Here, we regret to say, the comparison between Professor Blunt and Archdeacon Paley must cease. Their works when regarded as Evidences can only be spoken of in contrast. We cannot imagine it possible for any one to rise from the perusal of the Horæ Paulinæ without a full conviction of the *authenticity* of S. Paul's Epistles. Their *genuineness* and *inspiration* are distinct questions, which the author did not contemplate. He proved his point. On the contrary, we cannot imagine the possibility of Professor Blunt's Coincidences working conviction on the mind of any one who was disposed to deny the authenticity of the books of the Old Testament. We fear it would tend rather to weaken the position of the orthodox than to strengthen it at all. The critical acumen of the German philosophers would shiver his chain to pieces, link by link. We are sincerely grieved to be obliged to say this: for the Church owes to Professor Blunt a debt of gratitude for valuable services, which we should be the first to acknowledge as they deserve. But in times like these it were worse than idle to dissemble the truth for the sake of mere compliment. Mr. Blunt is too honest to do it himself, or to wish us to do it.

To return to the point from which we set out. Will the trustees of Mr. Hulse's bequests receive in good part a suggestion which is offered in no unfriendly spirit? They have heard enough of German Rationalism; but they are not perhaps aware of the strong under-current of infidelity which is sapping the foundations of the faith of thousands in our own land; nor of the systematic endeavours that are being made, by means of lectures and the press, to disseminate among the lower orders in our metropolis and provincial cities, principles utterly subversive, not only of all religion and morality, but of all social order. We all know how utterly inadequate the ordinary resources of the Church are to meet this monster evil. The overworked and underpaid Parochial Clergy of our densely peopled manufacturing districts, fully occupied with their own flocks, which they tend in the midst of wolves, are utterly powerless to stem the tide of atheistic and antinomian error which the unrestrained license of the press is pouring forth upon the neglected myriads. Is it too much to hope that, under these appalling circumstances, the munificent bequests of which they are the administrators may be made available for the maintenance of Truth beyond the limits of the University, where, through the singular mercy of God, it is now least endangered? It is not for us to suggest how this may best be done. All that we desire is to inform them of the real condition of the country, of which they may perchance be ignorant,—for the surface is fair enough, while the disease is preying on the heart's core,—and to pray them, as wise physicians, to consider how they can best apply the remedy which has been placed in their hands for the public good. It is impossible to deny that the duties as at present exercised are an useless, an inconvenient, perhaps a mischievous mockery: and the offices a snug piece of patronage for private friends, or at best a mere reward of literary or academic merit. It were well worth an experiment, whether they might not be made substantial blessings, by being brought to bear upon the leaven of Infidelity, so as to counteract, or at least to check, its accursed influence.

Art. VI.—*The Agamemnon of Æschylus; the Greek Text, with a Translation into English Verse, and Notes Critical and Explanatory.* By John Conington, B.A., Fellow of University College, Oxford. London: John W. Parker. 1848.

'In the present work,' says Mr. Conington in his preface, 'I 'have undertaken to perform two duties, which in English 'literature have been usually kept distinct, that of a translator 'and that of a philological commentator. Though there does 'not seem any reason in the nature of the case why a scrupulous attention to the text and an appreciation of the poetry of 'an author should exclude each other, it would appear to be a 'fact that in this country the two are rarely found together. 'In Germany the case is different: there is by no means so 'broad a line of demarcation drawn between them; and publications professing to exhibit both are very frequently to be 'seen. The explanation of this fact obviously is, that there 'both philosophy and poetry, in its widest sense, are subjects of 'very general interest; each is felt to have some national value, 'and a wish naturally arises among writers and readers to 'include both in one comprehensive view; while with us 'neither can be said to excite any great measure of thoughtful 'attention, so as to enter in any real extent into public education, and thus both are alike left to small classes of students, 'who, jealous of their own art, are slow to perceive its bearing 'on any other.' We hope that this reproach, though still not undeserved, is, so far at least as relates to the appreciation of the poetry of the Ancients, infinitely less deserved than it would have been a quarter of a century ago. With a true and genuine poetry of our own, and a just sense of the superiority in every department of Christian over Heathen art, we have regained a truer heart and eye for the poetry of the Ancient World. Nor have we been absolutely without an effort to combine the functions of philological with those of poetical illustration. Mr. Mitchell's 'Aristophanes,' in spite of obvious faults of inaccuracy and prolixity, will, we think, be always entitled to honourable mention as a successful effort to treat as a living mind, and surround with a living interest, an author who, to his own and the student's misfortune, had never before been served up with more appetizing sauce than Potter's 'Antiquities,' and those heaps of philological and antiquarian sawdust which are accumulated in the volumes of Bekker. But, however this may be, we will take upon ourselves to promise a hearty welcome and full appreciation to a scholar who, uniting poetic feeling with philological erudition and critical acumen, can perform the double task comprehended in the present work, and thereby at once enhance to the learned and open to the unlearned the pure and ennobling pleasures of Grecian art.

It is no light labour which a translator of the Agamemnon undertakes. Of all the productions of Greek intellect the Drama is the most characteristic, and therefore the hardest to represent adequately in an English dress. It is in the Drama that the Greek language, with its symmetry, its condensation, its logical and philosophical precision, most completely baffles and abashes him whose vernacular is a heterogeneous mass of Greek, Latin, Saxon, and Norman rubble—the coarsest and most inaccurate, though at the same time the most forcible and copious, of all the dialects of Babel. The difficulties which arise from the general structure of the language, however, must be felt more or less by the translator of any Attic writer. Aristotle and Thucydides are not easily rendered into a tongue which can hardly produce a single perfect set of cognates extending through substantive, adjective, verb, and adverb, which generally expresses by the same word a single act and a continued action, which makes shift to form a genitive, or rather a possessive case, by adding the masculine possessive pronoun to nominatives of either gender, and in which Carlyle alone dares to coin compounds, while all orthodox writers are driven to import them. But the Drama presents difficulties peculiar to itself. It teems with the language of Heathen Theology, which has no parallel in the language, because, happily, the ideas denoted by it have no parallel in the minds of a Christian nation: while, on the other hand, the words which the translator must employ to represent it, themselves denote ideas and raise associations peculiar to Christianity. It is as if one should attempt to produce a copy of the Parthenon out of the wreck of a Cathedral. The plan, the dimensions, the number of the pillars, might be the same. But the Attic marble, the tints of the Attic sun, the clear, sharp outline, which was the delight of the Attic mind, would all be wanting, and every stone would tell that it had once stood in a far different edifice beneath a far different sky.

Again, what the Tragedians are to other Greek authors, that is Æschylus to the other tragedians. His Drama is the very type of the Greek language, and the very Canon of Greek Theology. In him too the Choric element, with all its metrical and poetical difficulties, is most predominant. And, add to all this, in him Athenian art is young. A great master of language must that translator be, who is not compelled to represent archaism and *naïveté* by a certain quaint and mouthey phraseology—the lisp of infancy by the lisp of affectation. Youthful art, moreover, as seen in Marlowe, in the earlier plays of Shakspere, and in all those of his Grecian counterpart, is prone to exaggeration and bombast. And here again the translator must be sore perplexed. He has to perform the delicate operation of causing such ebullitions of the overfull heart as *λαμπὰς — φαρμασσομένη χρίματος ἁγνοῦ μαλακαῖς ἀδόλοισι παρηγορίαις*, and *κάσις πηλοῦ ξύνουρος διψία κόνις*—to take a step backwards from the ridiculous into the sublime; and he is fortunate if he does not end by making them take one more step *forwards.* Add to all this the almost startling superiority of the Agamemnon and the Prometheus to all the other dramas of Æschylus, and we have some notion of the difficulties to be encountered by Mr. Conington in the work before us. Let us see how he has met them. It has been justly said, that what are commonly reputed the fine passages of Hamlet would suffer more by being separated from the body of the play than the play itself would suffer by their loss. The same remark would probably hold good of fine passages selected from the Agamemnon. Yet we can devise no better means of enabling our readers to estimate the powers of a translator than by such selections, and to them accordingly we must resort. The first passage which we shall extract will be an *experimentum crucis.* Half the choric odes in the Greek Tragedians are to us pretty much what the words of an opera would be without the music. The metre is no metre to our ears. Its arrangement is a mere question of the driest possible scholarship. A translator might, where there is sufficient body in the poetry, do very well in dispensing with metre altogether, and contenting himself with rhythmical prose, either broken up into unequal lines or not; as his fancy led him. But this is not the case with that glorious ode in which fading light alternates and struggles with deepening gloom, from the exit of the watchman—with glad tidings on his lips and a dark secret on his heart—to the entrance of Clytemnæstra; and least of all, with the unequalled lines of which the following is a translation.

'Zeus, whoe'er he is, if such the name—
Suits his royal pleasure well,
Thus would I his style proclaim—
Else in sooth I cannot tell,
Weighing every power I know,
Save Zeus alone, if I indeed may throw
From my breast this causeless woe.—
He who ruled the subject world before
Blossoming in strength's array,

Speechless lies, a thing of yore:
And the next has passed away,
Thrice o'erthrown upon the plain:—
But he who swells to Zeus the triumph-strain,
All of wisdom shall obtain,—

Zeus, who doth to wisdom guide
Mortals,—who hath firmly tied
Love to suffering, there to bide.
Thus in deep sleep before the heart distill
Cold sweat-drops, wrung from thought of former ill,
And Prudence comes on men against their will.
Such gifts the gods shower down in man's despite
From their glorious thrones of light.
So the chief of Grecia's train
Eldest-born, in nothing fain
Of the prophet to complain,
Timing his breast to meet the tempest's sway,
When in the exhaustion of windbound delay
The Achæan host were wasting fast away,
Compelled in front of Chalcis' shores to wait
All in Aulis' refluent strait,

And breezes from Strymon southward sweeping
In the holiday of famine ever keeping
Men in harbour, yet leading them astray,
Of vessels and cable-ropes unsparing,
The flower of Greece were gradually wearing,
Stretching time back a weary, weary way:—
When for the wild wind's blowing
A cure yet more severe,
The charge on Dian throwing,
Pealed forth at length the seer,
Till the Atridæ sunk in grief profound,
Smiting with their sceptres on the ground,
Could no longer check the tear,
'Twas then the elder chief began his saying—

"Oh! hard is the fate of disobeying,
And hard too, if I must slay my own,
The pride of my house, my dearest daughter,
Polluting with streams of virgin slaughter
A father's hands beside the altar-stone!—
What choice has not its anguish?
O how shall I forsake
The hosts that daily languish,
Our formed alliance break?
Yes, 'tis just their rage should crave the spell
Of a virgin's blood the storm to quell—
Well—my blessing let them take!"
But when he the yoke of force put on,
Breathing forth change of spirit, as a wind,
Unrighteous, unholy, he was won
At once to all recklessness of mind—
For that counsellor of ill,
That wretched, desperate self-deceit
The unconscious madness of an erring will,
Springing from early sin unpardoned,

The mortal heart full oft has hardened.
So then he had the heart to kill
That young and lovely one,
To speed a war in woman's cause begun,
And take the charm from off the fleet,
Her prayers and her 'father'-calling cries,—
The spring of her tender virgin life—
All these seemed as nothing in their eyes,
Stern judges, hot thirsting for the strife.
When at length the prayer was done,
The father gave the priests command,
As 'twere some kid's above the altar-stone
To lift her form from where they found her,
Fallen, with her robes all streaming round her,
Body and soul alike o'erthrown,
And bear her raisingly,
Binding those beauteous lips, whose bitter cry
The house of Atreus else had banned,
With cruel thongs' speech-stifling power.
There as she shed to earth her saffron shower,
Her glancing eyes' too tender dart
Struck pity to each slayer's heart:
She stood as in a painting, calm and meek,
As though in act to speak,
For oft aforetime had she raised the lay
Amidst her sire's gay halls, and purely chaste
The glad carousals of the festive day
With love's sweet singing graced.
The rest I saw not, nor explain;
But Calchas' words shall ne'er return in vain.'
—Vv. 155—238.

We would only observe that we cannot quite acquiesce in Mr. Conington's translation of vv. 175, 176.

'Such gifts the gods shower down in man's despite,
From their glorious thrones of light.'

The original, according to the common reading stands thus—

δαιμόνων δέ που χάρις βιαίως
σέλμα σεμνὸν ἡμένων.

Instead of βιαίως Mr. Conington reads βίαιος, takes χάρις to refer to σωφρονεῖν ('prudence') in the preceding line, and paraphrases the passage in his note, 'Strange as it may seem, the free gift of the gods is forced on men.' We rather incline to retain the old reading βιαίως, and interpret these two lines, not as having exclusive reference to what immediately precedes, but as an independent moral sentiment, crowning the whole line of thought from the words Ζεὺς ὅστις ποτ' ἐστὶν—: 'There 'is a blessing, be sure, in the gods' sitting strongly on their seat 'of majesty'—'It is a blessed thing, in truth, that the gods rule 'with a strong hand'—a sentiment perfectly consonant to those political and social views of Æschylus with which every part of the Orestean Trilogy is instinct—to a greater extent, we believe, than has been generally supposed. The view we have taken is approved of, if we remember right, by Mr. Linwood.

Our second quotation shall be, by way of variety, not from a chorus, but from the dialogue. This also, if we mistake not, is a passage calculated to put the translator's skill to a severe test, being taken from the famous dialogue which takes place between Cassandra and the Chorus, before the prophetess goes to meet her doom—lines which, even when read in the spiritless version of Potter, are said to have caused sleepless nights to one of the first of English painters.

CASS. O! O! misery!
Again the sharp pang of true prophesying
Whirls me, and with its preludes makes me mad.
Look, look! see ye those youths there in the house
Sitting, in semblance like the forms of dreams?
Aye, children, butchered as it were by friends,
With hands full of the meat of their own flesh,
Stand forth! their entrails too they carry with them,
A piteous load—which their own father tasted!
And 'tis for this I say there's plotting vengeance
A dastard lion, wallowing in the bed,
Waiting, ah me, for him that comes, that master
Of mine:—for I must bear a slave's hard yoke.
Ruler of vessels, overthrower of Troy,
He knows not what the tongue of a hateful bitch
That talked so long and smilingly, like Ate
In secret, will devise him to his hurt!
Such is her daring: Woman will be slayer
Of Man! what hateful monster shall I call her
And hit it? Amphisbæna? or some Scylla
Dwelling in rocks, the bane of mariners?
One of hell's Bacchante mothers, truceless war
Outbreathing to her friends?—and how she shouted,
The all-daring one, as when the fight rolls back!
She would be thought to joy in his return!—
Well, 'tis all one if I persuade not—why?
The Future 'll come: and thou, here standing, soon
Wilt sigh, and own my prophecy too true.
CHO. The Thyestean feast of children's flesh
I knew and shuddered at: and terror holds me
To hear the tale in truth, and nothing feigned.
But, though I heard the rest, I lose the track.
CASS. I say thou shalt see Agamemnon's end.
CHO. Peace, peace, forlorn one, lull thy tongue to rest!
CASS. But there's no Pæon now for this I say.
CHO. Not, if it be: but may it ne'er be done!
CASS. Thou prayest against it: but they think of killing.
CHO. Then by what man is this sad deed devised?
CASS. Thou must indeed have read my sayings wrong.
CHO. Aye, for the means of one to do it I see not.
CASS. And yet I know the tongue of Greece too well.
CHO. Yes, and the Pythian fates: but still they're hard.

CASS. O me! how fierce the fire is! it comes on me!
O! O! Lycean Apollo! ah me! ah me!
She here, the two-legged lioness, lying with
The wolf in the absence of the generous lion,
Will kill me, wretch! and like one mixing poison
Will add the price of me too to her wrath.
Yes, as she sharpens for her lord the steel,
She boasts she'll pay back death for bringing me!
Why keep I still these mockeries of myself,
Sceptres, and prophet-garlands round my neck?
Off! I'll destroy you ere I die myself—
Go! fall and perish! thus will I requite you—
Endow another one with woes, not me.
And see! Apollo stripping me himself
Of my prophetic robes—yes, he that marked me
E'en in these trappings laughed aloud to scorn
By friends, by foes too plainly—all in vain!
They called me vagrant, like a fortune-teller,
A poor starved beggar—yet I bore it all.
And now the seer, undoing me, a seer,
Hath led me to such deadly fate as this.
Lo! for my father's altar stands a block
For me, when pierced with the hot bloody gash.
Well—we'll not die unhonored of the gods—
No—there shall come for us another champion,
A matricidal birth, his sire's avenger:
This wandering exile, stranger to the land,
Shall come, to crown this ruin for his friends:
For a great oath has by the gods been sworn,
That his fallen father's corpse shall bring him back.
Why then bewail I thus before the house?
Now that I have seen first Ilion's city faring
As it hath fared, and those that won that city
Thus in the judgment of the gods come off—
I'll go and suffer—I'll submit to die:
But here I call upon these gates of hell—
My prayer is to obtain a homestruck blow,
That without struggle, from the gush of blood
In easy dying I may close these eyes!
CHO. O much in suffering, much in wisdom too,
Maid, thou hast talked at length: but if in truth
Thou knowest of thine own fate, how, like a heifer
Heavenled, thus boldly walk'st thou to the shrine?
CASS. There's no escape—nought, strangers, more by time
CHO. Aye, but the last in time is vantaged most.
CASS. The day is come: scant were my gain by flight.
CHO. Well, know thou art bold, with a courageous soul.

Before quitting the subject of the translation for that of the notes, we must pause to commend to the notice of our readers the general criticisms on the Agamemnon, as a drama, contained in Mr. Conington's very able preface. 'Viewing it,' concludes Mr. Conington, 'in this light, as a product of an age when art 'was ruder, and human nature itself both developed in a rougher 'form and less completely apprehended, I believe it will be found 'difficult to overrate the Agamemnon.' Very difficult indeed, if, like Mr. Conington, you take the same common-sense view of Æschylus that you would of any modern writer, and give him credit simply for his own ideas, that is, for the ideas which he himself intended to express. But it is a difficulty soon surmounted by the more enthusiastic Germans, who find in a Greek tragedian the revelation which they can see no longer in the Bible. We cannot conceive anything more fatal to truthfulness and healthiness of criticism, and a right appreciation of what is really admirable in a Greek poet, than that system of mystical interpretation of which Klausen's plays are a very mitigated specimen. If this fashion is to prevail, our view of every drama of Æschylus and Sophocles (for Euripides, being the most philosophical of the three, is yet exempt) must shift with the evershifting cloud-sea of German metaphysics.

And we cannot help, with some diffidence, expressing our belief that the bent of Æschylus's mind was more political and less philosophical than has been generally supposed, and consequently that more of politics and less of philosophy is to be looked for in his poems. It is clear that to Aristophanes, and the party of which Aristophanes was the organ, their favourite poet appeared to be the representative of the good old times before philosophers were born; and though we do not by any means insist upon this argument as conclusive, it may at least be taken to indicate that extreme subtlety of speculation on moral and theological subjects was not the characteristic of the poet in the eyes of those for whom he wrote. Marathon was the name which he desired to be inscribed upon his tomb. And those who read the Prometheus as a production of the time when Athenian democracy was young, and the Orestean Trilogy as the last work of one about to fly for ever from the face of that democracy when it was approaching its full development, must, we think, see something more prominent than that change of tone on religious subjects which has been so often pointed out. As to the mysteries of Eleusis, which are supposed to have been the channel through which Æschylus derived some deeper views of morals and religion, we are strongly inclined to believe that the Pelasgian worship of Mother Earth which was there embodied was not purer but less pure, not more but less removed from Fetichism, than the Polytheism of the Ionian conquerors.

We now pass to the Notes. To convey any notion of the erudition which they contain within the limits of this article, is impossible. We shall follow a method analogous to that which we have adopted in displaying the qualities of the translation, and select some passages of noted difficulty here, as we have selected some of noted poetic beauty there. Mr. Conington prefers English as the language of his annotations, because it is more adapted than Latin for the purposes of subtle analysis—because it cannot form a cover, as Latin does, for all that scurrilous anility and laudatory cackling which disgraced the *egregii viri* of the old school of criticism—and thirdly on *liberal* grounds, because it tends to put an end to 'the dogmatic style of note-writing.' We agree, in the main, in all these reasons. Though with regard to the second, we cannot help observing that a comparison between the Latin notes of the good Elmsley and the English 'reprocities' of certain scholars of the present day, show that the adoption of the vulgar tongue is not in itself enough to make scholars talk like men and gentlemen, though no doubt Mr. Conington is right in saying that it may do something. As to the 'dogmatic style' of note-writing and of philological writing in general, to which 'the language of law and empire,' as Mr. H. N. Coleridge called Latin, is clearly congenial, we admit that it has been carried to very absurd extremes, especially by Dawes. But if the question is between the rationalistic or metaphysical and the phenomenal or positive school of grammar and philology, we must admit a certain illiberal prepossession in favour of the latter. Accurate observation of the phenomena of language seems to us to be both harder and more profitable than that facile though imposing generalization which the metaphysical grammarians and philologians are daily bringing more and more into vogue among us; and the expression of observations, compared with that of a metaphysical account of phenomena, must naturally appear dogmatic. What is the result of this metaphysical philology? Mr. Conington has to complain that 'there is no philosophical grammar of sufficient authority to be made a regular standard of appeal'—'that almost every editor has a grammar of his own.' Naturally—just as every metaphysician has a metaphysical terminology of his own. After all, in Grammar, as in Optics or Acoustics, it is only the secondary laws with which science can be conversant—the primary laws must be left to consciousness, and the particulars to observation. If we are to go on rationalizing without limit, we shall come at last to the predicament of that scholar who threw himself into the sea because he could not discover why Jupiter made Jovis. Let any grammarian tell us *why* the sign of the dative case is used in English to denote the substantive infinitive, and then we will ask him to tell us also *why* the sign of the genitive is used in French for the same purpose. Even so common and apparently unobjectionable an instance of metaphysical grammar as the nomenclature of the cases, will be found, on examination, to be by no means free from fault. What can be more absurd, or more calculated to mislead the learner, than the use of the same names, *genitive* and *dative*, to denote the ranges of signification respectively embraced by the second and third cases in Greek and Latin? Even the word *vocative* by no means adequately denotes the powers of the case to which it is applied. It appears to us that it would be almost better for the writer of a practical grammar simply to number the cases, pending that complete and final adjustment of the metaphysical terminology, by the appearance of a satisfactory philosophical grammar, which Mr. Conington pronounces to be still a desideratum, and which is absolutely essential to make the philosophical philologist intelligible to readers who are not familiar with his private nomenclature.

But to proceed to the Notes themselves. On vv. 49—51,

> τρόπον αἰγυπιῶν,
> οἵτ' ἐκπατίοις ἄλγεσι παίδων
> ὕπατοι λεχέων στροφοδινοῦνται,

Mr. Conington remarks that ἐκπατίοις ἄλγεσι is taken by Peile and others, after the Scholiast, on the old principle of hypallage, to mean 'grief for the loss of their young:' he himself, rightly as we think, preferring to render ἐκπατίοις *excessive.* We rather think that 'the old principle of hypallage' like 'κατὰ understood,' ὕστερον πρότερον, κατάχρησις, and many other venerable euphemisms for nonsense which passed current with the Busbies, and even with the Butlers and Keates, must now give place, and leave the grammatical phenomena which they have veiled open to more rational modes of statement. Πυθιόνικος ὕμνων θησαυρὸς would, we suppose, have been called an hypallage for Πυθιονίκων ὕμνων θησαυρὸς: yet the fact clearly is, that the words ὕμνων θησαυρὸς constitute but one notion; one substantive, in short, with which the adjective Πυθιόνικος naturally agrees. And we believe that half the so-called instances of hypallage may be explained away on the same principle. For example; 'Dare classibus Austros' in Virgil, is said to be put by hypallage for 'dare classes Austris,' which is simply saying that it is nonsense. How would 'launch the sea into a ship?' instead of 'launch a ship into the sea,' sound in English? Surely the poet might talk with no less propriety of 'giving their fleet the wind,' by putting the fleet in a way to catch the wind, spreading the sails and so forth, than of 'giving their fleet to the wind.'

> οὔθ' ὑποκλαίων οὔθ' ὑπολείβων
> οὔτε δακρύων, ἀπύρων ἱερῶν
> ὀργὰς ἀτενεῖς παραθέλξει.—Vv. 69—71.

This is well known to readers of Æschylus as a *locus vexatissimus.* We believe there are no varieties of reading, but there are endless varieties of interpretation. These are reviewed by Mr. Conington in a long note, at the end of which he says—

‘A better view of the passage is one communicated to me by ‘Mr. Lingen, of Baliol College, who takes the *ἱερὸν* to be the ‘sinner himself, *ἀπύρων* being added, *more Æschyleo,* as a ‘qualifying epithet; and compares Eum. 294, 5, where *καθιερω-* ‘*μένος* answers to *ἱερῶν*, and *ζῶν οὐδὲ πρὸς βωμῷ σφαγεὶς* modifies ‘the sense.’ This appears to us to be a very plausible suggestion, supported by a very happy illustration. We have only to go a little further and construe *ὀργὰς* as desire, (in which we think we are warranted by the etymological connexion of the word with *ὀρεγω*, by the radical meaning of ‘natural impulse or affection,’ from which the other meanings all diverge, and perhaps also by vv. 215, 216 of this play, *παυσανέμου γὰρ θυσίας παρθενίου θ’ αἵματος ὀργᾷ περιόργως ἐπιθυμεῖν δεῖ,*) and then we shall be able to interpret the passage in a way, as it seems to us, satisfactory in itself and suitable to the context. ‘Neither by ‘wails, libations, nor tears, will he (Paris) be able to appease ‘the intense desire (of the avenging deities) for a sacrifice not ‘offered with fire,’ *i.e.* for the punishment of the guilty.

> βοσκόμενοι λαγίναν ἐρικύμονα φέρματι γένναν,
> βλαβέντα λοισθίων δρύμων,—Vv. 118—119,

have also given abundant exercise to the ingenuity of commentators. The difficulty is to bring about a union, or some decent semblance of it, between the feminines *λαγίναν γένναν* and the so-called masculine *βλαβέντα.* ‘Oxen and wainropes cannot hale them together,’ though expedients very like ‘oxen and wainropes’ have been tried. By the never-failing *πρὸς τὸ σημαινόμενον, βλαβέντα* is made to agree with *λαγὼ*, which is supposed to lurk in *λαγίναν γένναν.* But this only removes one harshness to make room for another; for the hare in question is most manifestly of the feminine gender. Mr. Conington says, ‘*λαγίναν γένναν—βλαβέντα* is an instance of that looseness in ‘the use of genders which appears several times in this play, ‘and is not to be accounted for so much on the *σχῆμα πρὸς τὸ* ‘*σημαινόμενον* principle, which would suppose, *e.g. τιθέντες* in ‘v. 544 to refer to *ὄμβροι* understood in *δρόσοι*, as by the ‘unfixedness of the language at the time Æschylus wrote.’ This seems to us to be a far more sensible view of the passage than any of those adopted by preceding commentators; but we doubt whether the doctrine of the mutability of genders is not put rather too widely. Genders are, it is true, among the most arbitrary phenomena of language, but when once fixed they are generally fixed for ever. Perhaps, therefore, it will be safer to say, that both in this passage, and in vv. 560—562,—

> ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γὰρ κἀπὸ γῆς λειμώνιαι
> δρόσοι κατεψάκαζον, ἔμπεδον σίνος
> ἐσθημάτων τιθέντες ἔνθηρον τρίχα—

Æschylus uses the participle in *εις* as of two terminations; so that the irregularity or uncertainty is one of *declension*, not of *gender*. Compare *ἰδόντε καὶ παθοῦσα*, Œd. Col. 1676. In favour of his own view Mr. Conington, at v. 139, adduces Sophocles' Electra, vv. 725, 726, where, as the passage now stands, *τελοῦντες* must agree with the feminine substantive *πῶλοι*. But there it has been proposed to place what is now v. 726 next after v. 723; an alteration by which the sense would benefit greatly, as we think almost any one on reference to the passage will acknowledge, and at the same time the words *πῶλοι* and *τελοῦντες* would be effectually divorced. It is true that Hermann, acting consistently on the Aristotelian principle, *ἄμεινον ἀεὶ τὸ χαλεπώτερον*, stands firm to the old reading, and gallantly strives to prove in its defence, that two chariots running parallel to each other will naturally meet face to face. But then, Hermann, though the first of living scholars, is, as Porson said, a German. The conjectural reading, *δρόσοισι λεπτοῖς*, which Mr. Conington adopts at v. 139, being supported by the three precedents which we have just been discussing, must fall with them. And, independently of this, and whatever might be the variations of popular usage, we think Æschylus would scarcely have used the same substantive *δρόσοι*, both as masculine and feminine in the same play, as Mr. Conington supposes him to have done, especially as it would have been exactly the same thing, so far as regards the metre, whether he wrote *λεπτοῖς* or *λεπταῖς*.

μάντιν οὔτινα ψέγων—V. 179.

'*τις* generalizes, and thereby strengthens the negation,—"not 'only did he not reproach Calcas, but he said nothing against 'any of his order;" unlike Creon in Soph. Ant. 1055, *τὸ μαντικόν τοι πᾶν φιλάργυρον γένος*, &c.' This explanation seems to us to be pushed rather too far. Probably *μάντιν οὔτινα ψέγων* is to be classed with such passages as:—

'Anthea *si quem*
Jactatum vento videat.'—*Virg. Æn.* I. 180, 181,

τῷ γὰρ ἂν καὶ μείζονι
λέξαιμ' ἂν ἢ σοὶ διὰ τύχης τοιᾶσδ' ἰών;—*Soph. Œd. Col.* 772, 773.

'insignem repetens Nearchum,
Grande certamen, tibi præda cedat
Major an illi.'—*Hor. Od.* III. 6—8.

where 'si quem,' '*μείζονι*' and 'major,' seem to be respectively substituted for *si forte* or *sicubi*, *μᾶλλον*, and *magis*, or rather *potius*, as we conceive *μάντιν οὔτινα ψέγων* to be here substituted for *τὸν μάντιν οὔπως ψέγων*. 'Non omnis moriar,' for non omnino moriar, 'nullus dubito,' for nequaquam dubito, are instances of the same phenomenon, besides many others which might be quoted. So in v. 55—*ὕπατος δ' αἴων ἤ τις Ἀπόλλων*—*τις* must be rendered 'either *perchance*,' or 'either *it may be* Apollo,' &c.

> πνοαὶ δ' ἀπὸ Στρύμονος μολοῦσαι
> κακόσχολοι, νήστιδες, δύσορμοι
> βροτῶν ἄλαι, ναῶν τε καὶ πεισμάτων ἀφειδεῖς,
> παλιμμήκη χρόνον τιθεῖσαι
> τρίβῳ κατέξαινον ἄνθος Ἀργείων·—Vv. 185—9.

Upon this passage Mr. Conington observes, '*βροτῶν ἄλαι* is 'another expression the force of which has been missed by the 'commentators. They suppose it means "causing men to 'wander from the haven where they would be," *i.e.* in the present 'case, *by keeping them still*, so that the apparent contrast between '*δύσορμοι* and *ἄλαι* becomes an absolute contradiction. Æschylus *did*, doubtless, intend a contrast, but it was a peculiar one 'of his own between a physical and moral effect (see other 'instances below on v. 427); and it is this which I mean to 'express in my version, "keeping men in harbour, yet leading 'them astray;" making their minds wander by the vacancy of 'inaction, such as is felt in its most dreadful form in solitary 'confinement. Specific reference may be made to Tennyson's 'Mariana, as one of the most powerful delineations of what 'the feeling really is.' This explanation is certainly ingenious, and shows a determination to pierce to the very mind of the poet, and not to be satisfied with simply 'construing;' but we incline to think that it is rather too refined. The use of the word *βροτῶν*, which can hardly mean anything but 'men in general,' seems to lead to the inference that *δύσορμοι βροτῶν ἄλαι* is merely an 'epitheton ornans' of the 'gales that blow from Strymon,'—'those gales by which the mariner is driven from his course, and cannot make his port or anchorage.'

> τοιοίδ' ἕτοιμοι λαμπαδηφόρων νόμοι,
> ἄλλος παρ' ἄλλου διαδοχαῖς πληρούμενοι·
> νικᾷ δ' ὁ πρῶτος καὶ τελευταῖος δραμών.—Vv. 301—303.

'Peile and Linwood, though slightly differing in the method 'of construction, agree in referring this line to one and the same 'victor; "the first who run on to the last;" "a striking peculiarity," says the former, "differencing it from the ordinary '*λαμπαδηφορία*." But where is the peculiarity? If there was 'any transmission in the real *λαμπαδηφορία*, as is evident from 'the allusions to it in Lucretius and Persius, the same might be 'said of it; those who started first, and afterwards gave up 'the torch to others, lived in their successors no less than 'the beacon on Ida or that on Arachnæum. The omission of 'the article which Linwood notices, no more proves, as Butler 'showed long ago, that the same party is spoken of throughout, 'than does the similar expression τῶν ἁλόντων καὶ κρατησάντων, ' ten lines lower down. Nor yet need we seek for reasons why ' the first and last beacons are singled out for honour, such as ' that commonly given—that the one was the ultimate, the other ' the immediate source of the intelligence. The more natural ' view seems to be, that Clytemnæstra, in her joy, wishes to ' honour all, and names the first and last, leaving the rest to be ' implied; "Last wins as well as first."'

We believe this to be a new, and we believe it also to be the right interpretation of this difficult passage. To bring Mr. Conington's view out a little more clearly,—the words νικᾷ δ' ὁ πρῶτος—δραμών, rightly interpreted, draw a *parallel* instead of a *contrast* between 'the torch-race of the beacons,' and the common torch-race. In the common torch-race, the torches were transmitted along rival lines of runners; and the *line* which transmitted its torch first to the goal, won, each of the runners who composed it sharing in the victory. In like manner, Clytemnæstra says—'Each beacon in the chain shared in the common victory, as well the one next the starting place, as the one next the goal. In fact, the contrast, if any, is between the torch-race, in which several won, and the common race, in which only one could win.

We regret that the limits of this article do not permit us to do justice to Mr. Conington's elaborate note on the difficult and much controverted passage ὡς λέγοις πάλιν,—v. 308. This, with the rest of his work, we must be content to commend to the earliest and best attention of our readers. We trust that we shall be called upon at no very distant period to resume our critical labours, and that the present publication will be only the first of a series of valuable contributions to the library of the English scholar. Much remains to be done for us by the editor and commentator, still more by the translator. Among all our translations of the Greek poets, there is scarcely one—except Frere's and Mitchell's 'Aristophanes,' and, we may perhaps add, Chapman's 'Homer,'—which is at once true to the original, and sufficiently like an original itself to afford pleasure to the unlearned reader. Of Pope and Potter it is a needless cruelty to speak. Carey can hardly claim a more favourable verdict. The translation of the 'Agamemnon' by Mr. Symmons, to which Mr. Conington refers, is, indeed, full of spirit, but it abounds in erroneous interpretations, and is diffuse in the extreme. Mr. Sewell is close, but errs in the other extreme of baldness. Of that most delightful book the Greek Anthology,—illustrative as it is of the manners and feelings of the people of sunny Hellas from the banquet to the tomb,—many epigrams have been elegantly translated by different hands, and in different publications, but there is no considerable collection, except the very indifferent one of Bland. Nor need the observation be limited to the poets. Of the simple, genial, wonder-loving soul, and pleasant, *naïve* garrulity of old Herodotus, we have no better representation in the English language than that version of Beloe which has been justly compared to champagne poured into decanters. Almost equally unfortunate has been that great historian of the Athenian democracy, and perfect type of the Athenian mind—Thucydides—whose work would perhaps be the best guide-book that history could supply, wherewith to travel through the unknown lands of political and social experimentation on which Europe is now entering. Aristotle, we fear, must always be read in the original. But the Republic of Plato, as being, in addition to its transcendent artistic beauty and its anticipative Christianity, at once the ideal and *reductio ad absurdum* of Communism, might at the present moment be read in a good translation with the deepest interest. The Latin language, too, has its authors worth translating, and as yet not well translated. We point especially to those passages of melancholy beauty and almost *unclassical* tenderness, which relieve the more arid lucubrations of Lucretius; and to that sweet sensibility, which may easily be separated from the foul sensuality with which it is hideously, though not unnaturally, blended in the pages of Catullus. Most practically interesting too, in this age of decaying civilization, which conceals from itself its rottenness by refinement of manners at home, and the display of the military virtues, which survive the civil, in barbarian wars abroad, is the historian of the Roman empire; and most inadequately does Murphy represent his censorial dignity, his haughty brevity, his stern decree, and that touch of fire which at once paints the body of action most vividly and reveals its spirit most completely. Here is good work cut out for great abilities. And if it is said that great abilities would be wasted on translation, we may reply, that the same was once thought of lexicography—yet the lexicographer is now appreciated and honoured by all cultivated men—he has his reward—and that of the translator will not be wanting.

Art. VII.—1. *A Letter to the Very Rev. the Dean of Chichester, on the Agitation excited by the Appointment of Dr. Hampden to the See of Hereford. By* Julius Charles Hare, M.A., *Archdeacon of Lewes.* London: J. W. Parker, West Strand. 1848. Pp. 66.

2. *Postscript to the Second Edition of Archdeacon Hare's Letter to the Dean of Chichester on Lord John Russell's Letter to the Clergy of Bedford, and in Reply to Mr. Trower's Plain Remarks.* London: J. W. Parker, West Strand. 1848. Pp. 131.

3. *The Church and the Universities. By* R. Whately, D.D., *Archbishop of Dublin, &c.* London: Fellowes. 1848. Pp. 39.

4. *A Reply to Lord John Russell's Letter to the Clergy of Bedford. By* A Layman of the Church of England. London: Cleaver. 1848.

5. *Letter by* F. D. Maurice, *Professor of Theology in King's College, London, on the Attempt to defeat the Nomination of Dr. Hampden.* London: Pickering. 1847.

6. *A Letter to Lord John Russell, on his recent Conduct in Church Affairs. By* A Clergyman. London: Rivingtons. 1848.

7. *A Letter to a Clergyman in London on the Theological Character of Dr. Hampden's Bampton Lectures, and the Extent and Value of subsequent Qualifications of their Meaning. By* W. H. Mill, D.D., *Rector of Brasted, Kent, and one of the Proctors for the Clergy of the Diocese of Canterbury in the Convocation now Sitting; Domestic Chaplain to the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.* London: Masters. 1848. Pp. 32.

8. *An Attempt to Justify the Agitation against the Appointment of Dr. Hampden to the See of Hereford; a Letter to the Venerable Archdeacon Hare. By* A Tutor of a College. London: Rivingtons. 1848.

9. *The Bishop of Oxford and Dr. Hampden, with an Appendix of Correspondence.* (C. E. K.) London: Murray. 1848.

10. *Plain Remarks on Archdeacon Hare's Letter to the Dean of Chichester, with a Postscript on the Bishop of Oxford's Letter, and a Prefatory Notice of Lord John Russell's Reply to the Bedford Clergy. By* The Rev. W. J. Trower, *Rector of Wiston, Sussex, Rural Dean, late Fellow of Oriel College.* London: Rivingtons. 1848.

11. *The Reproof of Ignorance and Calumny. Being a reprint of the addresses of large bodies of the Clergy to those Members of Convocation who met in the Common Room of Corpus Christi College during the Controversy of* 1836. Oxford: J. H. Parker. 1848.

THE list at the head of this article shows that the Hampden controversy has been burning with unabated fury since the publication of our last number. It might seem almost superfluous at the present moment to chronicle events which must be as familiar to every reader as they are to ourselves, yet the present controversy has shown the importance of such a chronicle; for men's memory is fallacious, and unless preserved in a form more accessible than the newspapers of the day, the events of 1832, 1836, 1842, could hardly have been referred to at every turn as they were needed. Our readers, therefore, will not, we think, complain, if with a view to their future convenience, we narrate in order the events of the last three months. We are deeply convinced that whatever may become of the individual (a matter in itself of secondary moment), the questions which have been raised by the nomination of Dr. Hampden to the See of Hereford are not concluded, nor concluding, but beginning. We look forward like the great historian who prepared his materials from the very commencement of the mighty struggle between the rival races and principles of ancient Greece *ἀρξάμενος εὐθὺς καθισταμένου, καὶ ἐλπίσας μέγαν τε ἔσεσθαι καὶ ἀξιολογώτατον τῶν προγεγενημένων.*—We anticipate a contest whose conclusion it may not be our lot, nor that of our antagonists, to witness. We expect reverses and successes, manly deeds of Christian endurance, and saddening disappointments. But, above all, we feel that the stake is not whether a ministry shall stand or fall, or even whether the government of a diocese shall be delivered to worthy or unworthy hands for the short space of one man's life, or whether the present generation shall witness the dissemination of sound or unsound principles. The stake is, whether this Church of England shall or shall not continue to exist. For, important as is the individual case of Dr. Hampden, its importance is now almost lost in the greater questions which it has raised,—questions affecting the foundations of the English Church.

Our narrative concluded, (in page 230 of our last number,) with the election of Dr. Hampden by the majority of the Chapter of Hereford, the Dean and Canon Huntingford protesting. As the report of these proceedings, given in the newspapers at the time, and reprinted in some of the magazines, was in several respects incorrect and unjust to the Dean, we may mention that he did all that seemed possible to mark his dissent from the act of the majority. In his own words:—[1]

> 'In regard to the announcement in the Choir of the election, I purposely erased the words, "the Dean *and Chapter* have elected," and substituted the words, "a majority of the Chapter of this Cathedral Church have elected," &c.; and previously to that, that I might not even in semblance appear to act inconsistently, I, on reading the certifications, &c., to the Queen, Archbishop, and Bishop elect, remarked that it ought not to be "the Dean and Chapter," but *a majority* of the Chapter, as I was dissentient; but this was overruled by the *numbers* present, and I did not think it *necessary* to press it. I afterwards declined to affix the seal personally, which was done by three Canons Residentiary.'

Finally, to each of the three documents required to be filled up on the occasion, he appended and annexed his protest against its validity, and in the address to the (pretended) Bishop elect, he required the usual words, 'unanimously,' and 'no one dissenting therefrom,' to be omitted, so that the space which these words should have occupied actually remained blank. These facts should be recorded in justice to the Dean, as he was represented in the public papers of the day as having made some 'compromise' in this election, a statement which seems the very reverse of the fact.[2]

---

[1] Letter to the Times, Dec. 31.

[2] As all the documents of this case are important, we have appended in a note these forms, as well as the Dean's Protest.

'CERTIFICATE TO THE QUEEN.

'"To the Queen's most Excellent Majesty, Victoria, by the Grace of God, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland Queen, Defender of the Faith, &c.

'"We, your Majesty's loyal and devoted subjects, the Dean and Chapter of the Cathedral Church of Hereford, humbly make known and intimate unto your Majesty, that the see of the Bishopric of Hereford being void by the translation of the Right Reverend Thomas Musgrave, late Bishop thereof, to the Archbishopric of York, and your Majesty having granted unto us your royal license that we should proceed to the election of a fit and proper person to supply the vacancy now occurring in the said Bishopric, we did proceed on Tuesday, the 28th day of December instant, to elect a person provident and discreet, and recommended by his knowledge, life, and morals, being born in lawful wedlock, of lawful age, ordained in priest's orders, and knowing and being able to defend the rights and liberties of the Church, and did on the same day elect the Reverend Renn Dickson Hampden, Doctor in Divinity, having regard as well to your Majesty's gracious recommendation of him as to his merits aforesaid, to be Bishop and Pastor of the Church and See of Hereford. In testimony whereof we have caused our common seal to be hereunto affixed, this 28th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1847."

To this was *annexed and appended* the following protest:—

'"I, John Merewether, Doctor in Divinity, Dean of the Cathedral Church of Hereford, do hereby protest against this proceeding as an election, inasmuch as certain persons have voted, who (I have reason to believe, being merely honorary prebendaries, and not having conformed to the provisions of the statutes of this

And now Dr. Hampden was, we suppose, considered to be elected, and all that remained was that his election should be confirmed by the Archbishop of Canterbury or his commissioners, and that after this confirmation the Archbishop

---

Church, which I have sworn to observe), are not qualified to vote in chapter, and also because the majority so constituted has not, according to the said statutes, the Dean and three Prebendaries at the least voting therein; and I require and claim the power of extending this my protest, and that this my protest be duly annexed and appended to the significations and certificates of election, to the Bishop Elect, to the Crown, and to the Archbishop.

'(Signed) "JOHN MEREWETHER, Dean.
'" Attested by Richard Underwood, Notary Public.
'" J. H. Knight,
'" Richard Spencer, } Witnesses."

'" To the Most Reverend Father in God, William, by Divine Providence, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England, and Metropolitan.

'" We, your humble and devoted servants, the Dean and Chapter of the Cathedral Church of Hereford, humbly signify, with all obedience, reverence, and honour, that the Bishopric of Hereford being lately void by the translation of the Right Reverend Thomas Musgrave, late Lord Bishop thereof, to the Archbishopric of York, and having received from her Majesty the Queen her royal licence to proceed to elect the Reverend Renn Dickson Hampden, Doctor in Divinity, to the said Bishopric and Episcopal seat in the Cathedral Church of Hereford, did on the day of the date hereof, proceed to elect a Bishop, to fill the vacancy in the said See, and did elect the said Renn Dickson Hampden, he being a person provident and discreet, and recommended unto us by his knowledge, life, and morals, being born in lawful wedlock, of lawful age, ordained in priest's orders, and knowing and being able to defend the rights and liberties of the Church. In testimony whereof we have caused our common seal to be hereunto affixed, this 28th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1847."

'To this the aforesaid protest was also annexed and appended.

'" To the Rev. Renn Dickson Hampden, Doctor in Divinity.

'" We, the Dean and Chapter of the Cathedral Church of Hereford, in chapter assembled, humbly signify that, the seat of the Bishop of the Cathedral Church of Hereford aforesaid, being void by the translation of the Right Rev. Thomas Musgrave, late Lord Bishop thereof, to the Archbishopric of York, and having received her Majesty's royal licence to elect a Bishop and Pastor of the aforesaid Church and See, and by the authority and power of such licence, on the day of the date hereof, in our chapter house in the Cathedral Church, being capitularly assembled, and making a full chapter there according to right and custom, having first nominated and cited to such election all and singular the canons and prebendaries of the said Church (. . . . . . *) did elect you, the aforesaid Renn Dickson Hampden, Doctor in Divinity (. . . . . . †), to be Bishop and Pastor of the aforesaid Cathedral Church of Hereford, humbly requesting you that you will be pleased to signify your assent of your acceptance of the dignity, office, and burden of the Bishopric aforesaid.

'" In testimony whereof, we have caused our common seal to be hereunto affixed this 28th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1847."

'To this, also, the aforesaid protest was annexed and appended.

---

* 'Here a blank was left in place of the words, "and no one dissenting therefrom," objected to by the Dean as inadmissible.'

† 'Here a blank was left in place of the word "unanimously," objected to by the Dean as inadmissible.'

should proceed to consecrate him. Meanwhile, the storm of pamphlets, remonstrances, addresses, letters in the Newspapers, and leading articles, continued denser than ever. Of these we shall notice chiefly those which, not having appeared in a substantive form, are most in danger of oblivion; and, first, we present our readers with that which may be called Lord John Russell's statement of the case. To the Dean of Hereford he replied, as we showed in our last number, in the least amount of words capable of expressing an insult. But having despatched his letter of insult to the Church, written from the once consecrated abode of Woburn, and dated—we presume, for the same purpose—not Christmas Day, but Dec. 25, he could not deny himself the pleasure of enlarging upon the merits of himself and his nominee, and the demerits of all by whom he was opposed. Accordingly, Lord John received an address from the immediate clerical dependants of his family in Bedfordshire, and returned them a lengthy answer. The Address having been published as that of the Clergy of Bedford, it may be worth while to extract from *The Guardian* the following abstract of its signatures.

'Of all the clergy of Bedfordshire, thirty-two persons in Holy Orders have been found to thank Lord John Russell for the appointment of his favourite Dr. Hampden, to the See of Hereford. We only glance over these thirty-two unknown names, and discover among the nineteen incumbents nine who hold livings in the gift of his Lordship's family. Five more are curates, who sign without their respective vicars or rectors. Two gentlemen (Messrs. Pain and Hedges) do not say what they are. The rest are chiefly nominees of the Bedford Corporation, notoriously under the influence of the Russells. Such a display of weakness in his Lordship's own county could scarcely be anticipated.

This is the conclave of divines[1] to which his Lordship addresses his manifesto.

'TO THE RIGHT HON. LORD JOHN RUSSELL.

'We, the undersigned clergy, exercising duties within the county of Bedford, beg leave to submit our opinion to your Lordship on the following particulars.

'1. That we have no share in those feelings of alarm attributed to the clergy, through the activity of a portion of them, upon the subject of Dr. Hampden's elevation to the episcopal bench.

'2. That we have throughout this agitation of so grave a question looked for the affirmation and proof of some sufficient reason,—some unquestionable statement of erroneous doctrine, supported by Dr. Hampden,—some palpable evidence of unsoundness in the faith. But none such have we found; no proof or evidence of any 'strange doctrine contrary to God's word,' as held or favoured by Dr. Hampden.

---

[1] Six Rural Deans and thirty-five other clergy of Bedfordshire have since presented an address to the Bishop of Ely, strongly expressing their alarm at Dr. Hampden's nomination.

'3. On the contrary, we have seen charges advanced, upon the faith either of extracts from his works, or of general statements of their constructive meaning, which an examination of the original writings shows to be entirely unfounded—such extracts, by their garbled form in some instances, by false connexions in others, quite reversing the true meaning of the passages. And we have reason to think, that many of the clergy have received their impression of Dr. Hampden's doctrinal views from these untrustworthy sources.

'4. That, having seen these modes of impugning Dr. Hampden's orthodoxy so largely adopted, and having seen no one proof of unsound faith extracted from any of his writings, we hold ourselves at liberty to conclude (even those among us who have not made a thorough search through all his works) that none such are to be found.

'5. That we have indeed read sermons by Dr. Hampden upon the most vital and influential doctrines of the Christian religion, which we regard not only as admirable expositions of the truth upon those points, but sufficient also to satisfy our minds that the faith of their author and his view of Christian doctrine are worthy of all approbation.

'6. That, consequently, the only objection to the elevation of Dr. Hampden stands upon the authority of the vote of censure passed upon him by the University of Oxford, in convocation, in the year 1836; and that we do not, in the present day, regard that vote as of so much weight as properly to stand in the way of Dr. Hampden's elevation, for reasons which we think it unnecessary to mention.

'7. That Dr. Hampden has, since the time of his condemnation, received a direct expression of confidence, in the very article of previous censure, from the legitimate heads and governors of the University, whose age, and station, and responsibility, and maturer judgment, entitle their act, in our opinion, to more weight of consideration, as representing the sense of the University, than the act of a body composed in great part of younger and less responsible persons.

'8. That, under such circumstances, and reviewing the theological history of Oxford during the period that has intervened since the occurrence above alluded to, we consider the appointment to an episcopal station of one holding and stating the great doctrines of Christianity in that vital integrity, strength, and simplicity exhibited in Dr. Hampden's sermons, a circumstance favourable to the health of the church.

'A. J. Crispin, Vicar of Renhold.
'W. S. Chalk, Rector of Wilden.
'Edward Swann, Chaplain of the Infirmary.
'W. Monkhouse, Vicar of Goldington.
'William Henry Greene, Rector of Steppingley.
'John Wing, Vicar of Stevington, and Incumbent of Elston.
'George Maclear, Chaplain of the Prisons, Bedford.
'Henry Fuller, Vicar of Willington.
'Henry Pearse, Rector of St. John's, Bedford.
'Thomas Shuttleworth Grimshawe, M.A., Vicar of Biddenham.
'J. W. Hawksley, Rector of Knotting and Souldrop, and Turvey, Beds.
'John Gaskin, Curate of St. Paul's, Bedford.
'Benjamin Trapp, Vicar of Thurleigh.
'John Theophilus Wilkin, Curate of Stagsden.
'Thomas Pierson Richardson, Vicar of Great Barford with Roxton.
'George Thornton, Vicar of Sharnbrook.
'H. F. Lodington, Curate of Yelden, (to all except the fifth.)

'John Mendham, Rector of Clophill.
'Alfred Brown, Vicar of Flitton.
'Thomas Pearse, Vicar of Westoning.
'Antony Pulley, Rector of Whipsnade.
'Thomas Farrell, M.A. Curate of Cardington.
'Benjamin Maturin, B.A., Curate of Biddenham, Beds.
'William Mudge. Rector of Purtenhall.
'H. Seymour Yates, Vicar of Henlow.
'Alfred James Lowth, Assistant Curate of Arlsey and Astwick.
'John P. Moore, Rector of Aspley.
'R. Pain, M.A., Aspley.
'C. Hedges, M.A., Aspley.
'H. Mathew, Rector of Eversholt.
'H. Hutton, Incumbent of Woburn.
'Henry Le Mesurier, Second Master of Bedford School.'

'Woburn Abbey, Dec. 30, 1847.

'Rev. Sirs,—I have received with great satisfaction the expression of your opinion on the elevation of Dr. Hampden to the episcopal bench.

'I rejoice to learn that you "have no share in those feelings of alarm attributed to the clergy, through the activity of a portion of them," on the subject of that appointment.

'Two grounds have been taken to justify the alarm, and account for the activity of which you speak:—

'The one is the vote of want of confidence passed by the Convocation of the University of Oxford in 1836; the other, the suspicion of unsoundness in the faith.

'With respect to the first ground, the Bishops of Durham and Norwich, and many other eminent persons, have pointed out the fallacy of placing reliance on a hasty vote of Convocation, passed in a period of party excitement, without due examination, and void of ecclesiastical authority.

'Mr. Woodgate has gone further; he has said, speaking of a similar vote, "The proper appeal is not to the passions of a mixed multitude, like Convocation, where, besides having no lawful jurisdiction in the case, there is no exposition of the law, no reference to precedent, no hearing of evidence, and where the same persons are at once prosecutors, judges, and jurymen."[1]

'But let us grant that the Convocation was justified in its distrust. Let us concede that the University properly decreed that Dr. Hampden should be deprived of certain functions and privileges belonging to his office, "because in his writings he had so treated theological subjects that in this respect the University had no confidence in him." Have we had no experience since 1836? Is it not possible that Dr. Hampden may have used expressions, obscure or careless. which might induce the University to distrust his teaching of theology, but that the evidence of eleven years of sound and blameless conduct as Professor of Divinity may have removed the just causes of suspicion?

'Such I should imagine to be the opinion of the heads of the University itself; for, in 1842, they placed Dr. Hampden in the chair of a board of theological examiners.

'Such I should imagine to be the conclusion of the great majority of our bishops; for they have required from the Oxford candidates for orders certificates that they had received instruction in theology from Dr. Hampden. They were clearly under no obligation to do so. The Bishop of Exeter and a few other prelates have declined to receive Dr. Hampden's certificates, and have proceeded to ordain upon other testimony more satisfactory to them. So that, with the exception of five or six, our Bishops must have freely, voluntarily, and deliberately required the proof of attendance on Dr. Hampden's instructions in divinity as a necessary preliminary to ordination.

---

[1] 'Earnest Appeal to the Members of Convocation,' by H. A. Woodgate, B.D. &c., 1845.

'Can there be stronger proofs of the confidence reposed in Dr. Hampden, first by the resident heads of the University of Oxford, and secondly by the great majority of the Bishops? How few men have been elevated to the episcopal bench with a greater weight of authority in their favour! The head of a theological board of examiners, the teacher of candidates for the priesthood—can those who recognised and confided in him in these characters have believed that he held, himself, unsound opinions in theology? He who was to examine others? He whose training of young men was to qualify them to receive the solemn rite of ordination? Surely, this were to malign the University of Oxford and the great body of our prelates.

'But further. I have elsewhere alluded to the fact, that some time before I recommended Dr. Hampden to the Queen I communicated my intention to our venerable Primate, and received from him no discouragement. It is true that the Archbishop did not appear to think Dr. Hampden well qualified for the diocese of Manchester, neither, on reflection, did I think proper to recommend him to the Crown for that see, in the peculiar circumstances of its population and Dr. Hampden's studious career. But no one who has that veneration which I entertain for the candour, piety, attachment to the Church and State, and friendly kindness of our Primate, will believe the calumny, that he thought the appointment might not happen during his natural or my official life, and therefore concealed his opinion, that it would be an act of reckless insult and injury to the Church!

'I feel no doubt that the Archbishop, whatever objections he might have felt to Dr. Hampden in 1836, had become reconciled to his promotion by the orthodox and Christian character of his subsequent writings.

'It was, therefore, on due consideration of the proceedings of 1836, and of subsequent years; of Dr. Hampden's labours at Oxford; of the many instances in which his predecessors had been raised to the bench; of the policy of giving rewards to learning; and, lastly, of the zeal for our Protestant Reformation displayed by Dr. Hampden, that I named him to the Queen as successor to the Bishop of Hereford.

'I come now to the second ground of objection.

'After I had taken the Queen's pleasure, and Her Majesty had graciously approved of the appointment, I received privately from the Archbishop, publicly from thirteen of the Bishops, a warning that the elevation of Dr. Hampden would be disapproved by the majority of the clergy.

'Had this objection been founded on any just accusation against the life and morals of Dr. Hampden, it was not too late to confess my error and withdraw my recommendation.

'But, founded as it was upon a charge of teaching unsound doctrine, it behoved me not to desert a clergyman whom the Queen had been pleased to nominate for a bishopric without some authority or substantial proof.

'No such authority appeared. The conduct of the Archbishop and Bishops gave a strong presumption the other way. No such proof was given; you say, very justly, "None such have we found; no proof or evidence of any strange doctrine contrary to God's word, as held or favoured by Dr. Hampden."

'On the other hand, a strong testimony of the baseless nature of the charges against Dr. Hampden is to be found in the extracts made by his enemies from his writings; "such extracts," as you truly say, "by their garbled form in some instances, by false connexions in others, quite reversing the true meaning of the passages." The gross dishonesty of these quotations has been fully shown in an admirable letter by Archdeacon Hare. He observes, very justly, that by leaving out the first words of one passage and the last words of another, we might extract from Scripture the dogma, "There is no God," and the precept, "Go and sin."

'The learned and pious author of this letter did not originally—indeed, does not now—approve of the appointment. But I think, having proved so clearly the unfair means taken to ruin the reputation of Dr. Hampden, he must in candour allow, that if such means are to deprive a clergyman of those distinctions which our church boasts of maintaining as the rewards of learning and piety, a fatal blow is struck at all profound inquiry, at all enlightened pursuit of truth, at all clerical independence.

'Let us not mistake our position. The Church is not in that easy security of the last century which gave birth to so much negligence, to so much abuse of her wealth, to such a perilous apathy. The Church of Rome on the one side, with abundant knowledge, with imposing authority, seduces many to her communion. The right of private judgment is by many avoided as a dangerous snare; the duty of private judgment is thrown off by many more as too heavy a burden. On the other side, the Protestant Dissenter assails the Church Establishment as an engine for fettering the conscience and taxing the property of the subject. Novelties have their charm; the High Churchman and the Independent speak alike with complacency of separating Church and State.

'I know no better security against such a danger than an able and learned episcopal bench,—a zealous and God-fearing parochial clergy. Thus may the Reformation be defended, thus may the Establishment be maintained; otherwise, neither Parliament nor *præmunire* can beat off the assailants of our Church constitution.

'But it is said I have disturbed the peace of the Church. There is no use in crying "Peace, when there is no peace." The appointment of Dr. Tillotson to the primacy provoked a party whose unrelenting fury pursued him to the day of his death. They denounced him as a Socinian and an Atheist; yet our Great Deliverer never made a wiser or more judicious appointment. In our own day we have seen the learned Dr. Lloyd, once Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, pursued with bitter invective, when on the Roman Catholic Relief Bill he gave expression to the loftiest feelings of Christian charity.

'You have spoken with praise of the sermons of Dr. Hampden, and your testimony is in this respect peculiarly valuable. You consider his appointment as "a circumstance favourable to the health of the Church." It is in that view that, unconnected with and personally unknown to Dr. Hampden, I have recommended him to the favour of my Sovereign. I earnestly and devoutly hope that your anticipations and mine may, by the blessing of God, be amply fulfilled.

'I have the honour to be, with great respect,
'Your most obedient servant,
'J. RUSSELL.'

'The Rev. A. J. Crispin, Vicar of Renhold, &c.'

It is needless to expose the patent fallacies of this reply,—to repeat what his Lordship has so often been told, that those who proceeded against Dr. Hampden in 1836 pressed for a full and fair trial; and that that trial was refused them, only because Dr. Hampden's personal influence in the Board of Heads of which he is a member, and that of his partisans, enabled him to escape it. In the army and navy, an officer against whom there is so much as a *prima facie* case demands a trial for his own vindication. This one thing Dr. Hampden has throughout feared and shunned. Censures, suspicions, answers, these he would no doubt gladly have avoided, but these he could bear—a trial would have been destructive, for he must have been condemned.

And yet this is still his complaint and that of his supporters. There is a comparison for which Lord John is not responsible, but as no less an adherent of his party than the Archbishop of Dublin has ventured upon it, (to say nothing of the smaller fry, such as the Hon. and Rev. O. Forester,) it may be well to call attention to it—the contrast between the cases of Dr. Hampden and Dr. Pusey. The Archbishop says:—

> 'If the accusations against his doctrines had been really believed by the authors of them to be well founded, why did they not bring him to trial in a regular way, according to the existing statutes? This course was adopted, subsequently, in respect of a sermon of Professor Pusey's, which had been objected to, and which was accordingly submitted to a calm examination before persons to whom the statutes assign that office; and the result was a regular statutable suspension from preaching in the university for two years.'—P. 11.

It required certainly all Dr. Whately's courage to provoke this comparison. Dr. Hampden publishes two works which are immediately and indignantly assailed by the whole Church. The Heads of Houses refuse to bring him to trial. His accusers, who desire a trial above all things, publish to the world the grounds of their accusation. At length the Heads, driven by 'pressure from without,' propose a vote of censure upon him, which the University, (unable, according to that monstrous construction of the Statutes which Convocation still allows to go unquestioned, to do any thing more than say yes or no,) affirms rather than rejects. Here every thing is open and straightforward on the part of the accusers, but the authorities of the University refuse them a judge. The Archbishop declares that Dr. Hampden desires a fair trial. Why, then, does he not *now* suffer it to proceed? We shall soon have occasion to show that the Bishop of Oxford, declaring his own conviction of the heretical character of one of Dr. Hampden's books, states as his reason for not proceeding against it, that by the present law he cannot prosecute a Clergyman for an offence committed more than two years ago. Nothing could be easier to Dr. Hampden than by a single act to waive the benefit of this 'statute of limitations.' The Bishop writes him a letter asking whether it is his intention so to do, and obtains an evasive answer. At any moment the alternative of a fair trial is open to him. He still maintains the orthodoxy of all that he has ever published. Let him meet us in the Courts, with the first edition of the 'Observations on Religious Dissent' in his hands. Why does he not? In plain words, because he dares not. To the day of his death will this hang upon him. He may meet a trial whenever he dare; and till he does so he stands, as far as orthodoxy is concerned, in the unenviable predicament of pleading the statute of limitations, not to bar an unfounded charge, but to avoid the examination of one which he could not refute. His case is strictly parallel to that of that miserable man, (an incumbent of the Diocese of Peterborough,) who stood convicted by his own testimony of the grossest licentiousness, but against whom the Bishop of Peterborough, as he explained in the house of Lords, was unable to proceed, because of the same limitation of time. He comes to be consecrated, only because the law will not compel him to stand a trial for offences more than two years old, and without compulsion he dares not meet it. Now let us follow the Archbishop's challenge. How is Dr. Pusey circumstanced? He preaches a sermon, and is denounced by Dr. Fawcett, whose own published statements on the very point in question contain undeniable heresy.[1] Thus denounced, he demands a trial, and is refused. No passage is specified as subject to objection; he requests and cannot obtain a hearing. To this hour we do not know what parts of his sermon were intended to be censured, or whether the whole or none: so much for the accusation. For what was called his trial, the Vice-Chancellor, a known partizan, selected four of the decided party opponents of the accused, and one personal friend, who was known to differ from him.[2] This board pass sentence on the preacher whom they refuse to see, and when earnestly requested to state (not the reasons of their objection, but) the passages to which they object, they have ever refused to do so. Lastly, it is asserted by the friends and supporters of the judges, and has never been denied, that the whole proceeding was taken in consequence of a suggestion from high quarters in the State that the University ought to clear itself from the suspicion of Puseyism. Yet, so frantic is party spirit, this 'procés monstre' is that to which, after the lapse of five years, the Archbishop of Dublin is not ashamed to refer, not as a beacon but a model.

To return to Lord John Russell. He appeals to the conduct of the 'Heads of the University' in 1842, and forgets that on that very occasion the whole body solemnly renewed its censure of Dr. Hampden. He asserts that many Bishops have required his testimonial, but without naming one. Not one has come forward to plead guilty to the charge, while several have for themselves denied it; so that it rests at present upon the assertion of him who is forced in this very letter to acknowledge that the late Archbishop remonstrated against the nomination, after having suffered it to be asserted and believed for several weeks that it had received his cordial approval, and after having in the strongest manner implied that such was the case.

---

[1] See *Christian Remembrancer* for January 1845, vol. ix. (N.S.) p. 159.

[2] This one member always avowed his disapproval of the conduct of the Board.

And this man pretends to sneer at the notion that the Archbishop disapproved of Dr. Hampden's nomination, knowing well, as he admits, his objections to him in 1836, and remembering his words written after Dr. Hampden's explanations, and published by the Doctor himself:—

> '*Objections were entertained by me* and by others to certain passages in your writings. In your inaugural lecture you declared of these, in common with the whole of your books, that you meant nothing but what was orthodox in them. In a private letter to me you asserted in substance the same thing, and for this I then gave and still give you credit as a man of veracity and integrity, and consequently, if every passage objected to were specified, you would gain nothing which you have not already. But the main objection still remains,—that if, on the great topics on which he is to instruct students in Divinity, a man can so write that both common and learned readers mistake him, he is not a safe teacher. And this is a sufficient ground for those who believe your declaration, not to withdraw their disapprobation of the appointment, though they may not urge their objections further.'—*Letter to Dr. Hampden, Feb.* 20, 1838.

The Archbishop of Canterbury was not likely to urge, what Lord John could not but know, that Dr. Hampden had personally and publicly insulted him, so as to make it an outrage even to propose his elevation to His Grace; and in the face of this Lord John ventures to write,—'How few men have been 'elevated to the Episcopal Bench with a greater weight of 'authority in their favour!'

But it is useless to follow further this flagrant sophistry! The question lies in a nutshell. Did Lord John know, or did he not, that the appointment would be a most serious and painful shock to the religious feelings and convictions of the great mass of Bishops, Clergy, and religious laity? We do not believe he would seriously and calmly deny that he knew it. He would say that their feelings had no just foundation, but that he knew of their existence. It is then mere quibbling, unworthy of his high office, and much more of the seriousness of the subject, however in keeping with his personal character and reputation, thus to parade the real or pretended toleration of Dr. Hampden for peace and quietness' sake in times past.

It may seem to Lord John vastly clever, but it will only sink him still lower in the estimation of all earnest and right minded men of what party soever. Neither can he long maintain the tone he assumes; he throws away the mask:—'It is said I have 'disturbed the peace of the Church. There is no use in crying Peace, where there is no peace;' and then he parallels this appointment with that of Tillotson by him whom he profanely calls 'our Great Deliverer.' If Lord John Russell's words mean anything, they amount to a declaration of hostility against all who disapprove of Dr. Hampden's theology, a religious hostility, that is, against the great body of Churchmen, both lay and clerical, against him who when he wrote still filled the throne of Canterbury, the majority of the Bishops, almost the whole body of Clergy, and almost the whole of that large proportion of the laity to whom religious matters have far greater interest than literary, commercial, or political.

We will not trust ourselves to speak of the moral and religious responsibility of such a declaration made by one whose station renders him for the time the representative of the sovereign. His supporter, Archdeacon Hare, remarks—

> 'It is true, that there are sad elements of discord in our Church, but also through God's mercy there are elements of peace. Imperfect and full of evil as her condition still is, there is a zeal, there is a devotedness to the duties of the Pastoral office, there is a desire after holiness, nay in spite of all our distractions and quarrels there is a yearning after union and unity, far beyond anything that has been seen at least within the last two centuries And they who love Jerusalem should not only pray for her peace, but should also do what they can to promote it; and should refrain most watchfully from whatever is likely to disturb it . . . To appoint a Bishop on the ground that he is strongly opposed to any party, would, it seems to me, be utterly reprehensible.'—P. 71.

These considerations have great force: but even in a worldly aspect so headlong an avowal of party hostility by one in Lord John's position seems hardly politic. There are, it is probable, some thousands among the clergy, and at the very least some tens of thousands among the laity, who care little about mere politics—who do not pretend to understand matters of finance—whose principles would lead them as far as may be to support the powers that be, and who accordingly had actually given support, according to their power, to his administration. By an act of wantonness he has made every one of these men probably thus far a politician, that it has become one of the first desires of his heart by all lawful and Christian means to oppose and remove from power Lord John Russell—a desire never likely to be forgotten or changed, because it is founded upon a deep moral loathing of his conduct, in forcing upon the highest seat in the Church of Christ one whom they deliberately regard as the wanton assailant of Him who is to them more than country and friends, and home and family, and whom he has treated (to borrow a deliberate sentence of Dr. Mill,) with 'profanity.'

It is no consolation to know that he has appointed one of whom we need not fear that he will make objectionable principles popular by his influence, or extend them by his active exertions. He has already held during eleven of the most eventful years which the Church of England has known, a post in itself, perhaps, the most important beneath that of a Bishop. He has been during those years as complete a cypher as any man who ever reposed his head to sleep upon a dignified cushion, or lolled in a stall. What has Dr. Hampden done since 1836? He has preached several respectable sermons, written several testy insulting letters,[1] and engaged in one act of gratuitous unautho-

---

[1] Let the following letter, which the widow of the justly honoured John Davison addressed to us some years ago, be considered by all who would if they could respect Dr. Hampden, and let them try to imagine the conduct of Dr. Arnold under the same circumstances :—

'TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

'SIR,—I presume to trouble you in consequence of a paragraph in a published letter from Dr. Hampden, the Regius Professor of Divinity in Oxford, to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, in which Dr. Hampden states that "the late Mr. Davison, the highly gifted and excellent author of the 'Discourses on Prophecy, had both read and expressly approved his Bampton Lectures."

'I have the best reason to believe that Dr. Hampden is mistaken in his impression upon this subject. I was never absent from Mr. Davison but for one short interval after the period of the publication of those Lectures, and am well satisfied they were not read by him. Mr. Davison never mentioned the work to me, with approbation or otherwise, and I possess the presentation copy, received in August, 1833, which was *uncut* at the time of Mr. Davison's removal from me, with the exception of *two leaves ;* and it remained so till the year 1836, when it was seen by several friends in its unopened state.

'I have thought it hard upon me, and upon the friends of Mr. Davison, that his name should, at a distant period, be implicated in the controversy arising out of these Lectures; and, under the circumstances, I felt it to be due to his memory to ask of Dr. Hampden his authority for the assertion contained in the letter to the Archbishop; but to my surprise and mortification, I have had from him a *positive and final refusal.* I am therefore obliged to take the only means within my reach of relieving Mr. Davison from the responsibilities in which Dr. Hampden has involved his name.

'I shall feel obliged to you to give this letter a place in your *Christian Remembrancer* for the following month.

'I have the honour to be, Sir,
'Your very obedient, humble servant,
'*College Green, Worcester, 7th August,* 1838. MARY DAVISON.'

Or, let them read the insulting letters written by Dr. Hampden to the late Archbishop of Canterbury, and published by himself, under the title of 'Correspondence between Dr. Hampden, Regius Professor of Divinity, and Dr. Howley, Archbishop of Canterbury;' they are reprinted in the 'British Magazine' for Jan. 1848, and are so important that we had serious thoughts of reprinting them ourselves: but they extend over sixteen pages. In one of these letters he says, as he has said elsewhere, 'I retract nothing that I have written.' As to his language towards the Archbishop, the 'British Magazine' truly says:—'We shall leave the rized petty persecution, in which he was foiled by the law of England. Why then, it may be asked, should so great an opposition be made to his advancement in the Church, when men more dangerous have been promoted unopposed? We reply, not certainly because we fear any evil from the personal influence of Dr. Hampden. When consecrated we have little doubt he will go on as he has hitherto done. We shall have an occasional charge against Tractarians, an occasional sermon with no fault except dullness, and this, varied by any little spiteful annoyance which his situation may enable him to offer to those whom he considers his personal enemies, will we really believe comprise the whole annals of his Episcopate. There is nothing to fear in all this except the total loss during his life of those many services which a Bishop, one in heart with his Diocese and devoted to his office, may and does discharge. This is a mere negative evil. Meanwhile, however, there is another sufficiently positive. He is not promoted for the talent or influence of his works, but for their heterodoxy. The fact is certain and unquestioned. Lord John Russell may choose to express it in one form of words and we in another, but however expressed, it is because he has assailed the creeds and doctrines of the Church Catholic that he is made a Bishop. He comes forward, therefore, as the representative of a principle, the principle of heterodoxy, and our contest is, not against the individual, but against that principle. If he had been suffered to obtain consecration unopposed, the principle would have been established, that heresy is no bar to the promotion of any man to the episcopate of the English Church; and this has, we may truly say, been felt by disputants on both sides of the question.

We suggested in our last number that this was the most probable explanation of Lord John Russell's selection. Since that number appeared, he has, as we have seen, avowed it. And though he does not avow any political purpose, we cannot help feeling that if the Whig Premier had retained a sore and revengeful remembrance of the year 1841;—and if his unofficial leisure had been employed in recalling the special overthrow

---

reader to judge whether anything in the Archbishop's speech ought to have provoked (as nothing could have justified) language so disrespectful and intemperate as Dr. Hampden then wrote and published. If neither the Bampton Lectures nor the Oxford censure had ever existed, those who disapprove of Dr. Hampden's appointment, and those who have come forward to remonstrate against it, may safely rest their defence on that correspondence, and appeal to every person of common sense in the country, whether the clergyman who could write such letters to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and print them, possesses that degree of temper and discretion which would warrant the prime minister in recommending his appointment to a station, for which the want of temper and discretion is quite sufficient to disqualify any man, whatever his theological opinions may be.'

of his party in that year, and the circumstances which caused it; he must have felt, both that the Church was the cause of his defeat, and also that defeat was the natural, nay, necessary consequence of the method in which the Whigs then assailed it. Appropriation Clauses, Dissenters' Marriage Acts, Registration Acts, Church Rate Abolition,—such as these were the weapons of the Whig ministry a few years ago. When it was too late, they must have felt that they had taken the bull by the horns. Were such Lord John's reflections, it is not impossible that he might farther observe, that the real power of the Church of England, great as he had by experience found it to be, had already been shaken by one cause—internal division. This had gone in some instances to secession, in many more it had weakened by dividing those hands which would have been irresistible in their united strength. We impute nothing—and really it may seem, and it is perhaps the case, that Lord John is a man to whom injustice would be done by imputing to him any serious and deliberate principle of action. It may be that he merely acted with the petulance and insult of a spoiled child, doing in wanton heedlessness all the mischief in his power. But one thing there is which would account for his conduct upon principles intelligible and consistent, at least, however discreditable. If he had set himself to think, How may the Church be most effectually divided against itself: what could he have done more than select for the office of a Bishop a man avowedly regarded with abhorrence as a heretic, and even a blasphemer, (whether with or without reason,) by the great mass of her members? If he had wished to prevent the extension of her influence in a single diocese: what better than nominate one with whom it will be impossible for the Clergy or laity of that Diocese to co-operate with any cordiality or confidence? if to prevent the body of Bishops from acting with any energy on behalf of the Church, or opposing any effectual resistance to any future plans of mischief, what better than place among them a man against whom many of them had already pledged themselves, whose promotion to the sacred office many more would feel it a solemn duty to oppose, and whose notorious implacability of temper made it certain that his dearest object would be to oppose, revile, and vilify, all whom he regarded as his opponents. If he desired to multiply secessions, what better way could be found than by publicly exhibiting to the whole world the English Church as a slave in matters of the most sacred duties to the minister of the day; who may already belong to any sect, however heretical, and who may probably in a few months be a Jew? Lord John Russell must have known that for years past, whenever a Roman Catholic or a

Dissenter has wished to reproach the Church of England, the favourite taunt has been, 'What could you do if the minister of 'the Crown should nominate Dr. Hampden himself for a Bishop'rick?' What could he do more to strengthen their cause than by showing that even that extreme case was practically possible?

We repeat it, we do not impute these motives to Lord John Russell; they would imply a deliberate treachery, of which we should not desire to suspect any man. An English minister who should act thus, must have made up his mind to employ for the injury of the Church the powers which he well knows have been entrusted to the Sovereign for her good; he would be guilty of a fraud, such as in private life would dishonour for ever the fairest character. Still, were the supposition less disgraceful, we should unhesitatingly adopt it, because none other seems rational and consistent. We have given much larger space to Lord John Russell's letter than it intrinsically deserves, because, so far as we know, it contains the only defence of the late nomination which can be considered authorized.[1]

We may pass over others with a light step. In the same paper appeared an address to Dr. Hampden, presented by Dr. Hawkins, and signed by fifteen of the twenty-four Heads of Colleges in Oxford, declaring themselves satisfied that his religious belief is sound, together with Dr. Hampden's answer expressing the same opinion. It was remarked in the papers at the time, that of these fifteen, all but one voted for the defeated candidate at the late University election. At first sight it might seem that this had little connexion with their testimony to the sound doctrine of a religious teacher. It is to be remembered, however, that Mr. Round was emphatically brought forward upon religious, not political grounds, so that the circumstance that the majority of the Heads were found among so very decided a minority of the University, only illustrates what we have before had occasion to notice—the little sympathy which in truth exists between these bodies. This matter is farther illustrated by a letter which the Dean of Carlisle, who is also one of the Board of Heads, thought it not unbecoming to publish in the papers. He addresses Dr. Hampden, to assure him that though he voted in the Board of Heads for the censure of

---

[1] We beg to direct attention to the often-repeated wish of the Dean of Hereford to publish *the whole* of the correspondence between himself and the Premier. To this wish Lord John has never acceded. It has been publicly stated in the newspapers, and never contradicted, that that correspondence would show that Lord John Russell not only threatened a præmunire, but promised the Dean his own nomination to a bishopric if the election was unanimous. Will the Premier dare to allow the publication?

1836, yet, 'it was well known that the measure was carried 'through the Board of Heads of Houses with very great difficulty. 'For my own part, I shall ever look upon the consent I gave to 'its being submitted to Convocation as the most unsatisfactory 'vote I ever recorded as a member of the Hebdomadal Board. 'But if I had thought that the act in question was to be lasting 'and irrevocable, no power on earth should have induced me to 'be a party to it.' Why that which was heresy, or even false doctrine, in 1836, should be true in 1842, this poor Dean does not even attempt to show; only he distinctly states, what we have already assigned as the explanation of the conduct of the Board, that they acted 'under pressure from without.'[1] It is worthy of notice that the respected Provost of Worcester College, the representative among the Heads of Houses of the Evangelical school, is not found among Dr. Hampden's supporters.

Next appears an affectionate address to Dr. Hampden, from his curate and some parishioners of Ewelme, and the Doctor's answer. The addressers say, they know nothing of Controversial Divinity. Admirable judges, no doubt, of the point in question!

The letter of the Bishop of Oxford, however, is necessary to complete our history.

The University of Oxford being exempt (by Papal grant) from Episcopal control, the Diocesan has no more immediate power over the Professors than any other Bishop. But the rectory of Ewelme, which is annexed to the Regius Professorship, brought Dr. Hampden under his lordship's jurisdiction. The Bishop of Oxford was one of the prelates who remonstrated with Lord John Russell upon his nomination, and was known to have voted for the censure of 1836. At the close of last year, it was announced, that by his lordship permission, proceedings had been commenced against Dr. Hampden in the

---

[1] What the Dean of Carlisle says, painfully confirms a report which was current in the University in 1842, that the words in the censure upon Dr. Hampden, which provide that the Regius Professor shall be deprived of certain functions, 'till the University shall decree otherwise,' were inserted by the Dean himself, to enable him hereafter to say, that their meaning was 'till the University changes its mind.' Of course, we need hardly say, that the sense in which those words were taken by the body of the University was, 'till Dr. Hampden shall recant or cease to be Professor.' This instance confirms a conviction which we have before had occasion to express, that in dealing with the Hampden party among the Heads, the University must always be prepared for *tricks*. Yet it is no easy matter to baffle these tricks as long as the Heads maintain their present usurped powers of allowing no amendment upon their proposals, so that words which are suspected to be inserted with some secret intention, cannot be altered or omitted, unless the whole measure, which may be important or essential, is rejected. The Dean truly says, that the same party which originally compelled the reluctant Heads to do something, afterwards defeated his attempt to undo what was done.

Court of Arches. Nothing further was known until the appearance of the following letter:—

'Cuddesden Palace, Dec. 28.

'Reverend and dear Sir,—What has passed recently between us obliges me to mark in some detail the steps by which I have reached the conclusion which I desire to lay before you. And since, under the advice of your legal directors, you are led to decline all direct communication on the subject, I am further compelled to address you thus publicly.

'You are aware that when your nomination to the See of Hereford was first announced by common rumour, I thought it my painful duty to represent to the head of her Majesty's Government the inconvenience which in my judgment would arise from the completion of the rumoured appointment. This representation was grounded on the censure of the University of Oxford, and on the wide prevalence of a strong opinion of the unsoundness of some of your published writings. It did not assume the justice of this opinion. My desire—and that, I believe, of others—was, that an opportunity should be afforded you of publicly refuting these charges before your nomination to the office of a bishop. The representation, however, produced no such effect, and the apprehension and alarm which had been foreseen by those who signed it were speedily displayed. As one of their consequences, addresses numerously signed were presented by the clergy and laity to the archbishops and bishops, praying that all legal steps might be taken to prevent your consecration until the matters alleged against you had been brought to solemn decision. But in my own case more was done. As rector of the rectory of Ewelme, in this diocese, you were placed under my jurisdiction. This, it was thought, afforded an opportunity for obtaining an adjudication on the question, under the provisions of the Clergy Discipline Bill. I was accordingly addressed by several of my clergy with the request that I would employ this machinery to obtain such a trial by sending a charge against the soundness of your teaching to the Court of Arches. I at once declined to promote such a suit. I was then requested—by performing the needful ministerial act of granting the letters of request to them—to allow other parties to promote such a suit. Such an inquiry I did not think it right to prevent by the interposition of a mere official *veto*. I signed accordingly the necessary document, informing you in a letter dated December 16, that I had done so.

'At this stage of the business it was suggested to me by the promoters that, the matter being now in legal train, it was possible you might be willing to render to my private suggestion, as bishop of the diocese, the satisfaction which would otherwise be sought by a more painful process through the Court of Arches. I gladly adopted the suggestion, and desiring the promoters to suspend all further legal action till I had communicated with you, I wrote to you a second letter, in which I first stated, in detail, the points of doctrine which it was alleged in the "Articles" laid before me your writings had impugned, and asked you whether you would affirm your full belief in them. And, secondly, I asked whether you would be willing to withdraw the "Observations on Dissent" and the "Bampton Lectures," not as admitting their language to be unsound, but for the peace of the church, and because, in my judgment, as your bishop, and in that of others, they did contain unsound language? Had you felt at liberty to reply fully to my questions, and to consent to my suggestion, you would have given full satisfaction as well to the promoters of the suit as to me.

'In your letter dated December 18, giving full credit to the motives which led me to address you, you answer my first question thus:—" In perfect respect to you as bishop of the diocese, and for your personal satisfaction, I unhesitatingly reply in the affirmative. I say '*Yes*' to all your queries on my belief in that sense in which they are the plain natural sense of the statements of our articles and formularies." So far your answer was of course entirely satisfactory. To my request you gave no answer; and this silence I understood as tantamount to a refusal to withdraw the works in question; and satisfactory as I thought that your declaration of personal faith ought to be to all, I deemed it to be impossible for me to require the promoters of the suit to relinquish it while there remained unwithdrawn and unexplained language which appeared to me so dangerous as that which was contained, more especially, in your "Observations on Dissent" (first edition), which was then on sale in Oxford. I therefore wrote to you to say, that as the language which seemed to me unsound was not to be withdrawn, I could not require the promoters to abandon their suit.

'But immediately after writing thus, I learned from a letter of yours to a common friend, that it was with "no sanction of yours, and, indeed, *against your wish*, that any copies of the first edition of the 'Observations on Religious Dissent' were now sold; and that even of the second edition *you* had put forth no copies since its publication."

'This entirely altered my view of the case, and I at once wrote to you, requesting you to allow me to withdraw my last letter, because it closed a correspondence from which, if kept open, I now hoped much.

'I had now before me, as bishop of the diocese,—

'1st. Your unqualified declaration of faith, on the very points selected by the promoters of the suit as those supposed to be unsoundly treated.

'2d. The virtual withdrawal of what I deemed especially unsound.

'There remained only the withdrawal of the "Bampton Lectures" to fulfil every condition at first desired for my own or the promoters' satisfaction.

'At this time I received your published letter to Lord J. Russell, in which, to other explanations, you add the important admission—"I should be much concerned if, from any unskilfulness in the use of words, I should have given rise to misapprehensions. I would not assert, however, that I have always succeeded in conveying my thoughts exactly."

'This admission appeared to me the more important, because at the same time I learned from the common friend to whom I have already referred, that you had expressed to him a readiness to remove in any reprint of your "Bampton Lectures" any incautious or obscure language which might have given rise to the impression that they contained unsound doctrines, which you had not intended to put forth Had I been able to obtain from you a direct statement that such alterations should be made in passages which I was ready to point out to you, full satisfaction would have been afforded to those who objected to your consecration: but to my great regret, I learned that you were now acting under legal direction, and did not think yourself at liberty to answer, or even to receive, any such proposals. This I deeply regretted, because I am well persuaded that by such explanations and assurances as you could most honestly and easily give, the anxious fears of numbers now disturbed within the Church, might be at once allayed, and without such direct assurances some I fear will still remain unsatisfied. Thus, in fact, the promoters of the suit now expressed to me their wish for its continuance. With this I could not comply, for two reasons—first, because I believed that I substantially possessed already the explanations and assurances desired, and I felt that what the Church needed was, not the assertion of a point of honour, but a real security for the soundness of your doctrine; and, secondly, because

I believed that to allow now the suit to proceed would imply a far more direct judicial assent upon my part to its fitness than I had given in first signing the letters of request, for since I had performed that act, my position had undergone an entire alteration. I thought at first that the Church had a right to some assurance of the soundness of your doctrines before your consecration as a Bishop; and when no other way of obtaining that satisfaction appeared to be open, I did not even shrink, at the request of my clergy, from relegating the question to the decision of the Court of Arches. Since, at the suggestion of the promoters, and by your consenting to reply to my *quasi*-judicial questions, I had been led myself, as Bishop of the diocese, to assume the office of a judge in the cause. I could, therefore, no longer act merely ministerially in issuing letters of request, both parties had to a great extent committed the matter to my judgment; and now, unless I was satisfied that there was matter for a criminal suit, I could not think myself justified in sending an accusation against you to be tried in the Arches Court. Whether there was such matter could be determined by me only after a careful study of the works in question, with all your explanations in my mind. Regarding, then, the "Observations on Dissent" as virtually withdrawn, I accordingly applied myself to a thorough and impartial examination of the "Bampton Lectures." I have now carefully studied them throughout, with the aid of those explanations of their meaning which you have furnished, both publicly since their first publication, and now in your private communications. The result of this examination I am bound plainly to declare is my own conviction that they do not justly warrant those suspicions of unsoundness to which they have given rise, and which so long as I trusted to selected extracts I myself shared. For these suspicions of your meaning, and for the consequent distrust of the University, I must with equal frankness say that I discern the cause (whilst your works remained thus unexplained, and the minds of men unassured by your full profession of the faith) in what appears to me a not unfrequent overstatement of favourite views, and much obscurity of diction, resulting often from the arbitrary use of such words as "facts," "doctrines," "proved," "deduced," &c.; and hence I believe it happened that men of such various parties in the Church concurred not unnaturally in the expression of a painful distrust of your meaning. But allowing for these as the blemishes of what was, I believe, a necessarily hasty composition, and taking into account, as I now can, your various explanations and assurances, I find in the Lectures little which will not admit of a favourable construction. And if at times I long for the manifestation of a more evidently reverential spirit in the discussion of the highest mysteries of our faith, I yet read in them a thoughtful and able history of the formation of dogmatic terminology, not a studied depreciation of authorized dogmatic language, still less any conscious denial of admitted dogmatic truth—I see in them, in fact, so far, little more than what has been already expressed in the words (never, I believe, considered liable to censure) of one of the ablest of your opponents in 1834, who says, "If I avow my belief that freedom from symbols and articles is abstractedly the highest state of church communion and the peculiar privilege of the primitive church, it is . . . . first, because technicality and formality are, in their degree, inevitable results of public confessions of faith." And again, "Her rulers were loth to confess that the Church had grown too old to enjoy the free unsuspicious teaching with which her childhood was blest; and that her disciples must for the future calculate and reason before they acted."—*Newman's Arians*, pp. 41, 42.

'Having reached, then, this conclusion, through that close study of your work and explanations which the due discharge of the office of a judge required from me, I deem it my duty not only to be satisfied with the assurance I possess of your future revision of the work, and to withdraw therefore the letters of request, but also, with whatever force my previous desire of explanation, and my position as Bishop of this diocese may give to my words, to entreat those who have given utterance to their natural alarm at your appointment to weigh well the expression of my deliberate opinion, that you have given such explanations of what you personally believe on the points of suspicion, and what you intended as your meaning, as may well suffice to quiet all just alarm at your consecration to the office of a Bishop. 'I am, my dear Sir,

'Very faithfully yours,

'S. OXON.'

'To the Rev. R. D. Hampden.'

How much disappointment this letter caused to those who had hoped to see the question of Dr. Hampden's orthodoxy or heresy at length tested by a legal trial, we need hardly say. It would avail nothing to repeat the violent censures, and heavy imputations, which it called forth upon the writer. Perhaps, however, it produced more real sorrow in those who, fully and sincerely convinced of the purity of his motives, and his conscientious adherence to his own sense of right, could not doubt that his judgment had been misled by the subtlety of those with whom he had to do; for those who lightly imputed to him low and personal motives, could hardly have felt sufficient respect for him to suffer much by disappointment. Accordingly it was from the newspapers which supported Dr. Hampden, that the most violent assaults against the character of the Bishop proceeded.

Leaving these for the present, let it be observed, that the effect of the Bishop's step in withdrawing the letters of request, was to put a stop to all legal inquiry into Dr. Hampden's writings. For the Clergy Discipline Act, by a very unadvisable provision, makes it impossible for any one except his own diocesan to call in question the statements of a clergyman, be they how pestilent soever, and although every other Bishop, Clergyman, and layman, in England, should be convinced of their evil tendency. In this state of things Dr. Hampden and his friends very gladly acquiesced, and things remained *in statu quo* until after the 'confirmation of the election,' when the adroit Doctor thought himself secure from any steps upon the part of the Bishop of Oxford. Then, and not till then, the following letter appeared. It is addressed by Dr. Hampden to Mr. Faulkner of Havering-atte-Bower, the non-resident incumbent of S. Sepulchre, Cambridge; who, in that capacity, made a noise in the 'Stone Altar case,' while in the parish which he serves, he (as well as Dr. Hampden at Ewelme) suffers without annoyance to 'his Christian conscientiousness' that same 'Popish abomination.'

'Christ Church, Oxford, Jan. 7. 1848.

'Dear Sir,—Your warm expression of congratulation on my promotion to the see of Hereford demands my sincere thanks. The sympathy of one who has himself stood his ground so firmly against a violent Tractarian assault is most welcome to me. You did essential service by your resistance to that outrageous attempt of the Camden Society to intrude on your rights in your parish, and overbear your Christian conscientiousness. I am much obliged to you for the report you have sent me of the proceedings in that case. I shall have much satisfaction in going through it when I have leisure from the engagements which press on me at this moment.

'I have had abundant matter of vexatious doings the last few weeks. But I feel more than compensated for any personal annoyance by the good which I am sure will eventually come out of the present disturbance. The strength and designs of the Tractarian party (the real movers throughout, whatever may be said to the contrary) will have been disclosed, and the necessity of rallying the true Protestant spirit of our Church will have been demonstrated. I am deeply thankful to a good Providence for the course which events have taken.

'I am, dear Sir, yours faithfully,
'R. D. HEREFORD (Elect).'

'P. S.—The Bishop of Oxford would insinuate, in his letter to the *Times*, that I have made concessions to him. I shall be obliged to you most positively to contradict any such statement, should you hear it alleged—it is not true.

'The Rev. R. R. Faulkner.'

As Dr. Hampden now denied that he had made any concessions, the Bishop of Oxford became impatient to know whether he now abjured the benefit of the 'Statute of Limitations;' and would venture to make himself at the present moment responsible for the legal consequences of his past publications: for in this case the Bishop's reasons for dropping the suit against him were at an end. It will be seen that not even then (when we should have imagined the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Oxford over him was at an end), did Dr. Hampden venture to divest himself of his legal impunity, and that he returned an evasive answer. It is probable that he knew himself to be safe from any proceedings on the part of the Bishop: but that he felt, if he parted with his 'Statute of Limitations,' he might yet be deprived in another way, of his darling grievance, and be brought to trial in the court of the Archbishop. He wrote accordingly:—

'Cuddesden Palace, January 24.

'My Lord Bishop (Elect)—My attention has been called to a letter bearing your signature, and addressed to Mr. Faulkner, which has appeared in the newspapers. As no contradiction of its authorship has, to my knowledge, been made public, I imagine that I am not wrong (notwithstanding its unusual language) in attributing it to you. I beg, therefore, to call your attention to its postscript, and to request from you an answer to my concluding question.

'I withdrew the "letters of request" against you in consequence of an assurance from your own pen that you were not, during the two years to which the Clergy Discipline Bill limits your responsibility, answerable for any circulation of the "Observations on Religious Dissent," the only work which, in my judgment, could have subjected you to ecclesiastical penalties for uttering false doctrine. I must, therefore, beg you to inform me whether the words to which I have called your attention are intended to deny the truth of that assurance, which was conveyed to me in the following words as your own:—

'"It is with no sanction of mine, and, indeed, against my wish, that any copies of the first edition of my 'Observations on Religious Dissent' are now sold and circulated; in fact, I have not put forth any copies even of the second edition, since the time of its publication, and this is out of print, so far as my knowledge goes. Some one, therefore, must have been giving, I conceive, a fresh publication of that also, without my leave."—I am, my Lord Bishop (Elect), most faithfully yours, 'S. OXON.'

'The Lord Bishop of Hereford (Elect).'

'Hyde-park-gate, Kensington, January 26.

'My Lord,—I did not authorize Mr. Faulkner to publish my letter to him, nor the Provost of Oriel to communicate to your lordship the note to him from which you have extracted the passage contained in your letter of the 24th inst.

'Each was intended only for the person to whom it was addressed. I regret that either has gone further.

'The statements contained in my note to the Provost, and extracted from it by your lordship, are of course perfectly true; I never denied or wished to deny them, but I never desired or even contemplated their communication to your lordship.—I have the honour to be, my lord, your lordship's faithful servant, 'R. D. HEREFORD.'

'The Lord Bishop of Oxford.'

But the thing was not yet over. Next came forward Dr. Hawkins, who published in the 'Times' two letters, declaring that he was the common friend through whom the Doctor had communicated with the Bishop. He craftily congratulates the Bishop on coming over to his side: 'Allow me, however, first 'to say, that I am much gratified by your lordship's frank 'avowal of your change of sentiment in favour of the substantial soundness of Dr. Hampden's "Bampton Lectures." The 'conclusion at which you have arrived, will, I believe, be 'that of all competent and unprejudiced judges when they 'shall have studied them with equal care.' 'The conclusion at which your lordship has arrived;' what was that? Dr. Hawkins says, all competent and unprejudiced judges will come to the same; and it is his evident intention that every reader should suppose this to be the same with his own. Be it remembered then what it was. And here we will refer not merely to the Bishop's letter, which we have laid before our readers, but to the pamphlet signed C. E. K., which is evidently written by an intimate friend of the Bishop, and may fairly be taken as representing his lordship's view of the conduct, not of Dr. Hampden only, but, of Dr. Hawkins.

'The Bishop of Oxford, after sifting the whole case, aided by counsel, and in the presence of several clergymen and the promoters, was thoroughly

> persuaded that Dr. Hampden not only was not legally liable to a conviction for heresy in regard to the "Bampton Lectures," but that he had honestly and *bonâ fide* withdrawn, and that for thirteen years, the book which did contain, in the Bishop's opinion, some really heretical statements.'—P. 9.

Let this be remembered. In the Bishop's opinion, then, the 'Observations' do contain some really heretical statements. Moreover, after alluding to the remonstrance of the thirteen Bishops, he adds,

> 'It will be seen, indeed, by a reference to the Bishop of Oxford's letter, that his objections, even subsequently to a reperusal of the "Bampton Lectures," were of a far graver cast. Haste, irreverence in dealing with mysteries, and an unwarrantable pushing of peculiar notions, are charged upon the "Bampton Lectures," in that which may be well called the censure as well as the acquittal of Dr. Hampden. The Bishop, and, as I shall hereafter show, a considerable number of the signing Bishops, leave these very grave charges at Dr. Hampden's door, believing, at the same time, that there is not that in the Lectures which could legally be proved to be heretical.'—P. 5.

We have therefore Dr. Hawkins' authority for declaring that, in his opinion, any competent and impartial judge, who shall carefully study Dr. Hampden's works, will come to the conclusion that the 'Bampton Lectures' are hasty, irreverent in dealing with mysteries, unwarrantable in pushing peculiar opinions, but not liable to be convicted of heresy in a court of law—that the 'Observations on Dissent' are heretical, but that Dr. Hampden, while he still maintains all that he said there, would avoid the legal consequences of that avowal by pleading the statute of limitations, because more than two years have elapsed since he performed any legal act of publication.

Were this all, Dr. Hampden might say, 'Save me from my friends!' But of course this was not the sense in which Dr. Hawkins intended his words to be understood; and after declaring that the Bishop's opinion agreed with his own, he adds: —'Believing that his "Lectures" contain important truth, 'which most of us require to know, and that their real value 'has often not been perceived in consequence of some obscure 'or incautious language, I shall rejoice if he finds leisure and 'opportunity thus to clear and improve them.' It is easy to see that the effect of this is to make every reader believe this opinion as to the value of the 'Bampton Lectures,' notwithstanding their obscurity, to have been the Bishop's: and not that Dr. Hawkins agreed with the Bishop in believing Dr. Hampden to be a heretic, whom, owing to a legal subterfuge, the law would not touch.

To proceed; after Dr. Hampden was supposed to be safe, and not before, Dr. Hawkins, following his example, published a second letter, written Jan. 25, but not published till Feb. 14, to say, what he did not, strange to say, venture to mention in his first letter written before things were secure, that Dr. Hampden had not authorized him to show his letter to the Bishop, adding, 'I am aware that you employed the word '"assurance" in the sense of your receiving conviction, not 'Dr. Hampden's conveying any pledge. But having been 'personally concerned in this matter, I have been anxious to 'show that he is free (not that I wish him so to act, but that 'he is not pledged, and is therefore free) to republish his "Ob-'servations" at any time, and to reprint his "Bampton Lectures" 'without any alteration.'

Now, here we have one remark to make. We believe no man, of whatever way of thinking, who knows the facts, doubts that the two Doctors tricked the Bishop. Indeed, we doubt not, they had a hearty laugh together at the cleverness and success of their trick. To them there was no risk, for neither of them had any reputation for straightforward plain dealing to risk or lose. Dr. Hampden has ventured to declare, not only that he 'did not authorize Mr. Faulkner to publish the letter to him, 'nor the Provost of Oriel to communicate to your Lordship the 'note to him;' but also that 'each of them was intended only for 'the person to whom it was addressed. I regret that either has 'gone further.' Now observe the circumstances. For a month Dr. Hampden expresses no such regret, but reserves it until he believes (perhaps justly) that it is no longer in the power of the Bishop to take legal steps against him. Next, he wishes us to believe that having been living with Dr. Hawkins on terms of intimate daily intercourse ever since the 'Observations' were published fourteen years ago, knowing that Dr. Hawkins' views were the same as his own, and that no assurance of the withdrawal of the 'Observations' was needed for *his* satisfaction; knowing, too, that the Bishop was staying in Dr. Hawkins's house,[1] he chanced just upon that day to write a letter from his own house, a few yards off, to Dr. Hawkins, to assure *him*, (1,) that he had not done any act which would make him legally responsible for the 'Observations' for many years; and, (2,) that it was against his will that others had done so. This letter he wrote under these circumstances to Dr. Hawkins a few days after the Bishop had informed him by letter that the suit must proceed because he refused to retract the language of the 'Observations;' yet he did not mean or intend that Dr. Hawkins should communicate it to the Bishop. And, moreover, when Dr. Hawkins had communicated it, and the suit had been in consequence withdrawn, he regretted it, but kept his regret to himself till the time in which the Bishop could have renewed the suit was gone by. Then, and not till then, both he and Dr. Hawkins published their declarations that the communication to the Bishop was wholly unauthorized. It is little wonderful that the Bishop's friend, C. E. K., openly indicates his disbelief of this monstrous assertion,—'If Dr. Hampden asserts, as he 'does in his answer to the Bishop of Oxford, that both the letter 'to the common friend, as well as the postscript to Mr. Faulkner, 'were "intended only for the person addressed," I ask Dr. 'Hampden and your readers how that is consistent with the 'tenour of the postscript, which goes to request Mr. Faulkner 'to make known its contents wherever he may find it necessary, 'or with Dr. Hampden's presumed knowledge that the Bishop 'was staying in the lodge of the receiver of the letter at the time 'when it arrived?' It is to C. E. K.'s credit that he was able to convey this fact in language so little varying from that customary in society, and so unlike that in which Dr. Hampden himself spoke of the assertion of his Bishop, 'It is not true.'

---

[1] This Dr. Hampden, as Canon of Christchurch, must have known, for it is notorious to all Oxford that the Bishop came in there for the purpose of holding his Ordination in Christchurch Cathedral.

We do not know whether any of the readers of this Review may have had occasion to attend an election committee when some sharp attorney, who had been guilty of bribery, was under examination, for the purpose, if possible, of proving agency, which he is resolved to conceal. Should chance ever lead them to be witnesses of such a scene—it is not a very pleasant one—they will, we think, be forcibly reminded of Dr. Hampden and Dr. Hawkins. These gentlemen belong to a class to whom it is exceedingly important to remember, and who little need to be reminded, that by English law, 'a man cannot be required to criminate himself,' as well as the other glorious principle about offences committed more than two years ago. There are persons to whom legal knowledge is highly useful, and even necessary. 'Do you bite your thumb at me? Is the law on my side if I say, Ay? No. No, Sir, I do not bite my thumb at you,—but I bite my thumb, Sir.'

But while we think that only one opinion can exist among honest men, of whatever views, as to the trick practised upon the Bishop by these two clever Heads, we cannot, and should not, conceal our deep regret at the course which he thought it his duty to adopt. We are not astonished that in the heat of so momentous a contest, imputations, we believe, unfounded should have been thrown out, even upon his motives and uprightness. Second thoughts, we think, will convince fair men that these imputations and suspicions were unworthy: but we deeply lament the result to which the Bishop came in withdrawing the suit in the Court of Arches. As a mere question of law, we are not capable of discussing it fully. C. E. K. gives the favourable version of this untoward event:

> 'It had been first believed by the Bishop of Oxford (and the belief was grounded on an eminent legal opinion), that the Bishop's office, in sending a suit into the Court of Arches, was simply ministerial, and that all, therefore, which it was requisite for the Bishop to ascertain was, that the promoters believed the work in question to contain heresy.'

And afterwards,

> 'It was now, however, ascertained that, in order to send the suit into Court, it was necessary that the Bishop should accompany it with a declaration that he himself believed the book to contain heresy; for that the Bishop's office was judicial, and not simply ministerial.'

The Bishop's ultimate estimate, however, of the meaning of Letters of Request, is exceedingly questionable; for it was entertained, on what authority we are not told, in contradiction to an 'eminent legal opinion.' We are assured, moreover, that the legal profession in general are far from admitting the accuracy of his lordship's gloss. Neither can we understand how it could be necessary for the Bishop, in referring the case from his own Court to that of the Archbishop, which is, we believe, the simple legal character of Letters of Request, to declare his conviction of the guilt of the accused. It seems hardly possible that the law, which presupposes the innocence of every accused person, can require a Bishop to declare his conviction of the guilt of a person charged before him, before he is tried, even although the case is to be tried not by himself but by a superior Court. Now if it were sufficient that the Bishop should declare that there is strong *prima facie* ground of accusation, or any declaration in any degree equivalent, this it is plain the Bishop could safely declare, in accordance with his own estimate of the 'Bampton Lectures.' For something he felt there remained, even after the fullest allowance had been made for all Dr. Hampden's explanations, something which could not be explained, and which Dr. Hawkins promised him should be removed. That which he deemed it necessary to have removed, must have afforded a *prima facie* case of unsound doctrine. All therefore turns upon the question, whether the Bishop was mistaken in supposing that the law required him to pronounce Dr. Hampden guilty, as a previous condition to his being put upon his trial; and here we cannot but believe that he was mistaken. The matter is so important that we should much deplore that the interpretation adopted by the Bishop of Oxford's unnamed legal adviser, if any such were consulted, should be strained into a precedent. And while it is noticeable that the Bishop does not say that he acted on legal advice at all; only that 'it was ascertained,' &c., we believe that we are correct in stating that very high legal authority has been actually pledged against this view. If the Bishop of Oxford's be the true construction of the law, a more dangerous power to entrust to an individual it were impossible to conceive. But we are tolerably certain that his lordship's law is entirely wrong; and that he had not the power by law to dispose as he did of the complaint, which he had once accepted, and sent by Letters of Request to the Court of Arches. Surely in a question, of which the results were so great and immediate, to act without the first and weightiest legal judgments was to exercise a very perilous discretion. Meanwhile it is remarkable to see how every advocate of Dr. Hampden leaps at once to the enormous conclusion, that the Bishop has acquitted him; because he says that the law will not allow him to bring the 'Observations' into Court, and that he does not think there is legal ground for conviction in the 'Bampton Lectures' alone, explained as he explains them. We have seen this in Dr. Hawkins; Archdeacon Hare does the same; the smaller craft follow in the same wake; the Hon. and Rev. O. Forrester began, and we know not how many have followed—good men, they are 'thankful for small benefits.'

But still, though we thankfully admit that Dr. Hampden has not been acquitted by his diocesan, we are sure that the Church at large will feel more and more,—we can hardly doubt that the Bishop of Oxford himself will feel,—that, deceived by the professions of Dr. Hampden and Dr. Hawkins, he has taken far too slight a view of the mischief of that system which the 'Bampton Lectures' exhibit. Whether a heterodox writer shall be made a Bishop as a reward for his heterodoxy;—this were an important question. But in Dr. Hampden's case at this moment is involved one far more momentous. God forbid that the rationalism of Germany should spread to our Church! yet should it spread, a work which merely exhibited it in so cautious and covert a manner as this, and with so little popular talent, would be but little dangerous. At the present moment, to countenance and tolerate the writings of Dr. Hampden, is to introduce a new heresy—*the* new heresy of the age, into our Church. If the plague were raging in Germany, and we were free, we should be zealous in requiring that every ship from the infected shore should do quarantine. If the disease were as rife here as there, we might hardly notice the arrival of one which had nothing particular to distinguish it. Dr. Hampden acquires an adventitious importance, as we have already said, from the circumstances of the present day. His writings are the garment infected with the pestilence, which Lord John Russell would force upon us. We find our meaning so well expressed by a weekly cotemporary, *The Guardian*, that we are tempted to extract it, though it speaks with a commendation not undeserved, but which we of course should not have expressed, of the remarks of one of our coadjutors in the last number of this Review.

> 'For our own part, we must confess to the conviction, however uncomfortable and melancholy a one, that the controversy is rather at its commencement than at its close. A particular theory was laid down in the "Bampton Lectures," which, owing to the indolence or indifference of the writer, has slept in his mind ever since, and never come forth and energized; which theory, however, is now coming forth and energizing with considerable boldness. An acute and able writer of an article in the present number of the "Christian Remembrancer," has pointed out in a way which it would be difficult to meet, a most remarkable identity between the doctrinal theory of the popular author of the "Church of the Future," and the theory of the "Bampton Lectures." He has proved the same identity between the theory in the "Bampton Lectures" and Dr. Arnold's theological views. In the Arnoldian-Bunsenian system of doctrine, then, with its popular writing and appeals to the feelings of the age, we are threatened with what is, in fact, a true and proper development of the "Bampton Lectures." The theory of the "Bampton Lectures" may appear innocent to some persons, because the promulgator of that theory has not himself carried it out, and made it energize; but what will those persons say when they find that that theory is carried out and energizes in other hands! We have no pleasure in suggesting unpleasant thoughts to the Bishop of Oxford, and yet, in throwing a prophetic look forward into the future, we cannot be blind to some most awkward results which his present judgment on the "Bampton Lectures" will bring upon him. As the controversy which has lain so long dead in the "Bampton Lectures" awakens and unfolds in more popular and practical hands, and as it becomes clearer and clearer, the more the Arnold and Bunsen theology expands, that it is the same identical theology with that of the Bampton Lectures,—will not some misgivings occasionally arise in his lordship's mind? Will he not discover that he has with hasty benevolence whitewashed a book, the meaning of which has come out clearer in every stage of succeeding controversy?'—*The Guardian, Jan. 5.*

The more sincerely we respect the Bishop of Oxford's office, the more thankfully we receive his present services to the Church, the more hopefully we anticipate those to come, the more deeply must we deplore the fatal mistake into which we cannot but feel that he has been betrayed. He has not, we know, acquitted Dr. Hampden, as the advocates of the Doctor pretend. But, in truth and conscience, we cannot conceal our deep conviction, that he has treated his offence far too slightly. It concerns the vitals of Christianity: no one who read only the Bishop's letter could suppose that such is the case. He requests the Doctor to withdraw the Bampton Lectures, 'not as admitting them to be unsound,' but because his Bishop thought them so. He professes that Dr. Hampden's statement of his holding the doctrines of the Church was 'satisfactory,' when in truth it is not an explanation, but a denial of his unretracted statements. He expresses his 'fears' that without further explanation some will be dissatisfied. Above all, if we rightly understand him, he wishes farther opposition to the Consecration abandoned, not because Dr. Hampden is sound in the faith, but because he thinks the law of England will not afford the means of proceeding against him. Now, if indeed he has published heresy and will not retract it, then we are bound to resist his Consecration as and while we can. If the law will not help us, we are bound to call on our Bishops to violate the law of man by refusing, rather than the law of God by agreeing, to lay hands upon him in his unrepented sin and scandal. It is, indeed, a 'point of honour' for which the Church is contending, not our own honour nor the honour of men, but the honour of our Lord and Master, whom he has outraged and still outrages. In this cause, we call upon each of our Bishops, and notwithstanding all that has passed, upon none more confidently than upon the Bishop of Oxford. We say—Men, brethren, and fathers, help! Our faith and our children's faith is at stake. The souls of men, the glory of our Redeemer, the worship of our God; all for which our fathers have toiled and our martyrs bled, is at stake. The very foundation of our religion; the true meaning, and the only firm grounds of the very Creed of the Apostles, is canvassed and denied. Come with us to the battle, 'to the help of the Lord against the mighty!'

And now we have traced all that has happened in these three months, in which Dr. Hampden's orthodoxy has been directly concerned. More important events indeed followed, but we do not enter upon them here, for the objections against Dr. Hampden were never considered or discussed. Dr. Hampden's nomination was indeed most momentous, but the questions which it has raised are far more so. For the first time since the Reformation the question has been raised, what means the Church of England actually possesses, of preventing the elevation of an acknowledged heretic or profligate. This question has been raised but not yet decided. It is before the Church and before the world. The contest has begun; we may not shrink from it, and may God defend the right! But this momentous strife must not be treated at the conclusion of this article on the Hampden Controversy, out of which it arose, and we reserve it for a separate discussion. We shall therefore merely add, that Dr. Hampden's election was, according to their view of Confirmation, confirmed by the Commissioners of the late Archbishop, at Bow Church, on Tuesday, Jan. 11. The Doctor was, we believe, obliged to be present; certainly, there he was, to see the consummation of his triumph over the Church. The second lesson for that morning's service, we presume, was read, though it might have seemed personal to Dr. Hampden, containing as it does the account of the healing of the woman who touched the hem of the garment of our blessed Lord—the very miracle which called forth his most profane remark, of which Dr. Mill says:—

> 'When in accordance with all the Fathers of the Christian Church that preceded him, as with S. Paul, and with our Lord Himself, the Institutor, the greatest Doctor of the Western Church says, *Accedit verbum ad elementum, et fit Sacramentum,* "this maxim of Augustine," says Dr. Hampden, "appears to be, in fact, *an adaptation of the popular belief respecting incantations and charms to the subject of religion!*" (p. 315.) And that we may not overlook or misconceive the extent of this profanity, as applied to the sacred mysteries instituted by the Lord Himself, the incarnate word of Life, the application is made immediately after to the virtue proceeding directly from His sacred Body, for the cure of human infirmity and disease. This virtue,—the denial of reality to which makes the Evangelic narratives false and absurd, as they appear in the dreams of Paulus and the Rationalists,—this virtue, I say, is referred by the Lecturer to the same superstitious notions, entertained, as he says in words which it is scarcely tolerable to transcribe, "*even* by those who did not impute them to the agency of evil!" Is it nothing in the mind of this Professor of Christian Theology, that our LORD Himself sanctions and repeats the notion, thus daringly assimilated to the sorcery of evil demons?'

After prayers and litany, challenge was made to all who knew any cause against Dr. Hampden's consecration, to come forward, 'and they shall be heard.' The objectors then came forward in due form, and the Court, after hearing, in Dr. Hampden's presence, the argument of counsel why their objections should be received and weighed, refused to hear them, and confirmed the election. What Doctor Hampden's part in that day's ceremony appeared to the world, may be seen in the following article from *The Times* of the next morning.

> 'Dr. Hampden, we presume, has a "mission" to fulfil. That mission, to all appearance, is to turn the Church inside out, and demonstrate its anatomy to the people. After taking the Creeds to pieces—more pieces, in fact, than he can ever put together again—he next proved, upon his own person, how little power either Church or University had to interfere in such dangerous exhibitions. He has lived to laugh in turn at Convocations, Hebdomadal Boards, Academical Statutes, old and new, Ecclesiastical Courts, and Bishops remonstrant or recanting. Reversing the old encomium, "Nihil tetigit, quod *non ornavit,*" he has, either industriously or otherwise, brought into discredit every doctrine, institution, society, tribunal, ceremonial, office, person, or thing, with which he has come successively in contact. His last performance has been, doubtless against his will, but in pursuance of his destiny, to show up that venerable illusion, the share which the Church has in making a Bishop. Election and Confirmation, Dean and Chapter, and Ordinary, citations, præcognizations, declarations, and more venerable antiquities than we can remember, all collapse into "leather and prunella" as soon as the Doctor draws near. Of course there are some to whom the work of destruction is vastly entertaining. The instinct which prompts the child to destroy his penny trumpet in searching for the source of its mysterious strains, lasts throughout life, and spares nothing high or low, conventional or real, human or divine. We will not attempt now to discriminate between the subjects proper and improper for

a public exposure. The several forms allowed, recognised, or enjoined, under the statute of the 25th Henry VIII., cap. 20, venerable as they are, may be more readily sacrificed to the demands of an ecclesiastical burlesque than some other sanctities. However that may be, these had their turn at Bow Church last Tuesday; and in the person of Dr. Hampden it was most satisfactorily shown what a farce they all are.

'There never was such an Episcopal Confirmation, and we should hope there never will be again. As for officials, it was a regular turn-out of Doctors' Commons. There was a "host of clergymen." The Church was filled with a congregation, who, whatever they came for, did not all remain to pray. Outside there were a string of carriages and a crowd. Cheapside, for once, was choked by an Episcopal Confirmation. Never, we should think, since the respective mace-bearers of the two Primates filled the Strand with their quarrel, was there such an ecclesiastical stoppage of the metropolitan thoroughfare. As for solemnity, inside and outside the Church, it appears to have been much the same. A fight was expected, so the Litany went off rather dully, and towards its end the public impatience almost broke from all bounds. So eager was the interest displayed, that one might almost have thought King Harry himself, the author of the statute, would rise from his grave to see his posthumous triumph or defeat. He felt sure of its working, however, and slept on. Whatever his faults, he knew how to make an act of Parliament.

'As for the day's result, it is exactly what we had anticipated, and what the Saturday's well-timed rehearsal had prepared the public mind for. The Vicar-General, and his assessors, took care that, in the words spoken by a living statesman on a memorable but unfortunate occasion, "there was no mistake, there could be no mistake, and there should be no mistake" in the matter. The Confirmation came as pat as the *Q.E.D.* after a demonstration in Euclid. The letters patent were read, setting forth, among other things, that "the said Dean and Chapter (of Hereford), by virtue of our said leave and licence, have chosen for themselves and the said Church, our trusty and well-beloved R. D. Hampden, D.D., to be their bishop and pastor, *as by their letters, sealed with their common seal, directed to us thereupon, does more fully appear;*" and finishing with an express command to the Primate to confirm the said election. Other forms were gone through, the use of which was not very apparent. OYEZ, OYEZ, OYEZ, and a citation to opposers, were duly pronounced, and after an interruption which occupied some time, and some columns in our paper, but which in point of argument was a very small affair, the election was confirmed, notwithstanding all controversies and disputes which there might be about it. The letters patent closed the whole question of fact; and as for any charges against the orthodoxy of the principal party concerned, had he appeared in a turban, announcing his conversion to the creed of the Moslem, and his consequent admission to the college of Ulemas, or had it even been proved to the moral satisfaction of all present that there was no such a man as Renn Dickson Hampden after all, the result would have been the same. The order to confirm the election was as the laws of the Medes and Persians, and there was no reversing it.

'There was, however, a little difference on the Saturday's proceedings. On that occasion the doctors were all on one side. Thomas Gutteridge appeared in *propriâ personâ*, and after answering a few questions, found that he had nothing to do but to hear, and continue a silent spectator of the august ceremonial. "Well, then, listen," said Sir John Dodson,

"I am a blessed Glendoveer,
'Tis mine to speak and thine to hear."

'On Tuesday, however, there were three blessed Glendoveers on the side of the objectors, and the courtesy due to the order procured a shadow of a hearing. The hearing was on the statute, only on the statute, as the Court took care to admonish the objectors, when they showed any disposition to wander. Doctors Addams, Harding, and R. Phillimore, did their very best with an absolutely hopeless cause. They argued from the ancient usages and rules of the Church, from the obvious significance of the whole ceremonial at which they were assisting, from the common-sense of the affair, from the simple absurdity of a Confirmation which was no Confirmation, a citation equally ridiculous, a hearing promised and not given, and other such rational topics; but the letter of the statute, and the unbroken prescription of three centuries were not to be shaken. Their arms were ingenious and strong, and dexterously wielded, but they availed as little against Henry VIII.'s Act, as the spear of Achilles, or the arrows of Ulysses, would against a battery of Paixhan guns. They were civilly heard, but they were not even answered, except by the Court. The Horatii were not allowed a complement of Curiatii whereupon to exhibit their prowess. The Vicar-General, and Dr. Lushington, administered the law as gaily as an inquisitor might exhibit the implements of his profession. There was no reply to the Court. Another citation was pronounced, with no result this time except some expressions of indignation and of merriment from the several factions of the audience. *His demum exactis*, the election was "confirmed." Dr. Hampden was taken out in triumph, and vehemently cheered by a mob outside, who had all read his "Bampton Lectures" as much as the Bishop of Oxford, and were perfectly satisfied with the proceedings just transacted in the Church. The Bishop-elect was not chaired, but with some difficulty conveyed to a carriage. One of the horses, whether out of excessive zeal or repugnance to his service, fell down. There was some delay; not even the threat of *præmunire* succeeded in bringing the contumacious animal to his legs. So another carriage was procured, and leaving the objectors to talk about the Queen's Bench, the Doctor bore off his blushing honours to the far west.'

The Queen's Bench was then appealed to. No inquiry, of course, was made, in this stage of the proceedings, into Dr. Hampden's qualifications or disqualifications; a mandamus was applied for, on the ground that the Archbishop's Commissioners had refused to hear what those objections were, and to judge of their validity. It is worthy of mention, as a curious circumstance, if nothing more, that one of the judges who were for refusing the mandamus had been Dr. Hampden's counsel in the Mac Mullen case in 1842. It is the general rule that a judge refuses to sit in any case in which, before his elevation to the bench, he has been engaged at the bar. The present case was, in form, different from that in which Mr. Justice Erle was counsel, but in reality the same, as Dr. Hampden's orthodoxy was the real question in both. We should therefore have expected Mr. Justice Erle to have left the court that day. What is more remarkable is, that Mr. Justice Erle exchanged into the court, his natural place having been in the Bail Court, where he would have had nothing to do with this case. This circumstance caused much surprise at the time. It was afterwards asserted, we know not on what authority, that it was accidental, the learned Judge having chanced to be that morning in the full court, and out of his proper place, in order to hear another motion for a new trial, in a cause which he had tried. To this excuse we can only say, 'valeat quantum.'

After an elaborate discussion at the bar for four days, and several days' deliberation by the judges, the opinion of each was given separately. Mr. Justice Patteson and Mr. Justice Coleridge were in favour of granting the mandamus; Lord Chief Justice Denman and Mr. Justice Erle for refusing it. Under these circumstances the mandamus would issue according to the usual practice of the court. Lord Denman, however, refused it, saying that he felt great difficulty in doing so, because it was to refuse an inquiry, 'which in a railroad, or any ordinary case, would at once be granted.' But to allow the inquiry would be most dangerous to the Church, in his Lordship's opinion, and to the peace of the State; while its rejection was due to Dr. Hampden (*i.e.* he would be fatally injured by anything like a fair trial). Lord Denman did not allude to the effects which it might possibly have upon the administration of which he is a keen supporter. Under these circumstances, as the Ecclesiastical Court refused to act, and the Civil Court would not compel it, legal proceedings necessarily closed for the present.

Reports were soon in circulation that all opposition to Dr. Hampden's consecration was withdrawn. This premature statement, at least, was unfounded; for already the following protest, which was prepared before the vacancy of the See of Canterbury, but which for sufficient reasons was suspended, while legal proceedings were either in progress, or in prospect, has been lodged in the hands of the new Primate:—

PROTEST OF THE OBJECTORS.

'To the Most Reverend Father in God, John Bird, by Divine Providence Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England, and Metropolitan.

The dutiful Memorial of the undersigned, Richard Webster Huntley, M.A., of the University of Oxford, Vicar of Alberbury, in the Diocese of Hereford; John Jebb, M.A., of the University of Dublin, Vicar of Peterstow, in the Diocese of Hereford; and William Frederick Powell, M.A., of the University of Cambridge, Perpetual Curate of Cirencester, in the Diocese of Gloucester and Bristol,

'Showeth,

'That on the eleventh day of January, 1848, we appeared in the Court of your Grace's Vicar-General in the Church of St. Mary-le-Bow, for the purpose of presenting, in due form, certain objections, which in our consciences we believed it our duty, as priests of God's Church, to offer against the confirmation of the Reverend Renn Dickson Hampden, D.D., as Bishop and Pastor of the cathedral church and diocese of Hereford.

'We appeared in answer to a citation of the Court for that purpose, in which citation we were promised that our objections should be heard; but by the decision of that Court, when we appeared, followed by a division of opinion among the Judges of the Court of Queen's Bench upon a question of the statute law which had come to be involved in the aforesaid proceedings, we are now precluded, as we are well advised, from bringing our objections to a proper hearing and trial in any form presented by any of the Courts of this country.

'The said Renn Dickson Hampden is, we believe, about to be presented for consecration.

'At this crisis we ask permission to lay before your Grace this respectful but decided expression of our sense of a wrong done to us (and in us to the Church,) by our being refused a hearing; of the scandal of such an unreal and delusive citation; of the dangerous consequences of a form of confirmation so persisted in, as well as of the questionable character of a consecration administered under the aforesaid circumstances.

We still derive consolation from the hope that we shall not in vain seek for refuge in the paternal care of your Grace, as our Metropolitan; and that we may successfully implore you, as the Spiritual Head and Pastor of the branch of Christ's Church in this kingdom, to take into consideration (ere it be too late) the objections which it was then our desire to allege, and which, once for all, we declare our readiness to produce.

'Persuaded of your Grace's patience and paternal indulgence, we request leave to state that the said objections are founded upon the suspected unsoundness of the Rev. Dr. Hampden as a teacher of the Christian faith: that this unsoundness appears in his "Bampton Lectures," and in his "Observations on Religious Dissent," and that not only in particular or detached passages of those works, but also in the general character of expression, and in the drift and design of the whole.

'Those works, we submit, are calculated to unsettle the minds of Christians upon points of doctrine positively propounded by the Church as Catholic truths, and to reduce to the level of mere theological opinions those dogmas and deductions and exact declarations which have been carefully set forth in the creeds, and in our formularies, as things which "ought thoroughly to be received and believed."

'We do not assert these inferences upon our own mere construction of the teaching of Dr. Hampden, but we have his own explanation and commentary to this effect in the more popular of those works.

'We were prepared to show, in detail, that the said Dr. Hampden has in those writings, whether in intention or not, yet in fact, among other things, taught contrary to the VI., VIII., IX., X., XIII., XVI., XX., XXV., and XXXIV. Articles of the Church of England, and in derogation of other articles, including the first five.

'These, and further particulars, which we do not herein relate, we were ready, with assistance, to prove, if so permitted, in the Court of your Grace's Vicar-General, and we do yet desire to have a lawful opportunity of proving them, on evidence drawn at large from the same works of Dr. Hampden, which are still in circulation.

'We feel assured that your Grace will never be "hasty in laying on hands and admitting any person to government in the Church of Christ." And hence we confidently adopt, as our remaining and last resource, this appeal to those moral and religious obligations which are superior to every earthly consideration.

'Allow us, therefore, humbly to pray that a competent ecclesiastical inquiry into our objections, and into the whole of the works we have mentioned, may yet be made by your Grace, or under your direction, before the solemn act of consecration shall be proceeded with, in the face of all that has transpired of the alarm and suspicion which are shaking the confidence of Christian people, and of the gathering mischiefs which may otherwise fall upon the Church of God in this kingdom.

'In all that has been attempted in our names, we entreat your Grace to believe that, far from desiring to add to the uneasiness suggested to your mind by the case itself, or wishing to utter complaints, or to promote any public excitement on this painful subject, nothing would afflict us more than to have it supposed that our acts have been intended otherwise than as an expression of reverence for the solemn office in Christ's holy Church, to which your Grace is called, and of an earnest and dutiful desire to uphold the inherent spiritual rights of our Metropolitan.

'And thus heartily praying for all Divine favour and peace upon your Grace, especially at this time, we commend ourselves in all filial affection and humble respect to your benediction, and, in so far as in these proceedings our errors or our infirmities may require it, to your forgiveness. We have the honour to remain, my Lord Archbishop, your Grace's most dutiful servants and sons in the Lord,

'R. W. HUNTLEY.
'J. JEBB.
'W. F. POWELL.'

'*London, the fourth day of February,*
In the year of Our Lord 1848.'

Besides this, the following address and protest, which in a very few days received the signatures of more than 1650 of the clergy, was received by His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, who had previously been made acquainted with its contents, on Saturday, the Feast of the Annunciation:—

'To the most Reverend Father in God, John Bird, by Divine Providence, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of All England, and Metropolitan, &c. &c.

'May it please your Grace,

'We the undersigned Clergymen of the Church of England, desire to approach your Grace with deep reverence for your high office, and with earnest prayer for the Divine blessing upon your Grace's counsels and labours for the Church.

Your Grace's recent accession to the Primacy imposes it on us as a solemn duty to make known to your Grace those sentiments, already largely expressed by the Clergy, and graciously received by your venerated predecessor, with which we have viewed the events connected with the appointment of the Rev. Dr. Hampden to the See of Hereford. It is well known that, Dr. Hampden having been elected to that See, at the Confirmation of the said Election in the Court of the Archbishop certain objections were in due form offered; and that, although any and all objectors to the said Election had been cited to appear, the Judge and his Assessors refused to hear the said or any other objections, on the ground that the Court was not competent to receive them; and that, on an appeal to the Court of Queen's Bench, the judges were equally divided in opinion, thereby leaving the question of the validity of such confirmation still undecided. It is also notorious that the said Dr. Hampden has for many years laboured under the imputation of being a teacher of unsound doctrines, contrary to the true Christian faith, and the Articles and Formularies of the Church of England.

'We therefore, the undersigned Clergymen of the Church of England, humbly beg your Grace to receive this our solemn Protest against the Consecration of Dr. Hampden to the office of a Bishop, until such time as satisfaction shall have been given to the Church of the soundness of the faith and teaching of the said Dr. Hampden.'

'PROTEST.

'In the name of the Most Holy Trinity, Amen.

'To the Most Reverend the Archbishops and the Right Reverend the Bishops of the United Church of England and Ireland, the Protest of the undersigned Priests of the said Church.

'Whereas it is reported that the Rev. R. D. Hampden, D.D., was elected to be Bishop of the Church and Diocese of Hereford; and whereas it is also reported that the said election was confirmed in the Court of the Archbishop of Canterbury; and whereas it is also reported that, at such confirmation, although any and all objectors to the said election were cited to appear, and certain objections were in due form offered, the Judge and his Assessors refused to hear the said or any other objections, stating that the said Court was not competent to receive them; and whereas, on an appeal to the Court of Queen's Bench, the Judges were equally divided in opinion, thereby leaving the question of the validity of such confirmation still undecided; and whereas the aforesaid R. D. Hampden has for many years laboured under the imputation of being a teacher of unsound doctrines, contrary to the true Christian faith, and the Articles and Formularies of the Church of England; and whereas such imputation does not rest upon any vague report, but upon the deliberate judgment of many of the most learned Divines of the said Church, together with two decisions of the Convocation of the University to which he belongs—such judgment and such decisions being founded upon sermons and other writings published by the said R. D. Hampden, and still in circulation.

'Therefore we, the undersigned Priests of the United Church of England and Ireland, do hereby, in the face of the Holy Catholic Church, solemnly PROTEST against the consecration of the said R. D. Hampden to the office of a Bishop, and do implore your Lordships to surcease from consecrating the said R. D. Hampden until such time as satisfaction shall have been given to the Church as to the soundness of the faith and teaching of the said R. D. Hampden.'

The bearing of these latter proceedings upon Dr. Hampden's case seems pretty plain. If the law be as it is held to be by Mr. Justice Patteson and Mr. Justice Coleridge, confirmation is necessary to his legal admission to the Bishopric of Hereford, and legally his election has never been confirmed. Putting, therefore, votes against votes, it is as likely as not that he has when consecrated no legal claim to that particular see as not being confirmed: Bishop Hampden he may be; but not Bishop of Hereford. He may be in possession of orders, but not of jurisdiction. Canonically we presume that he has really no claim at all; though upon this question we do not feel qualified to enter at large, even if our space allowed it. What is the opinion of his opponents, appears by the advertisement, which they have just inserted in the public papers.

'[Advertisement.]

'DR. HAMPDEN.

'[SIR,—We are instructed to request that you will notify that in the matter of Dr. Hampden the promoters have no intention of proceeding by petition to the House of Lords: their plain object having been to try the fitness of Dr. Hampden for the office of a Bishop on the ground of suspected unsoundness of teaching; that they have had recourse to the appointed Court for the purpose of stating their objections, and, though promised a hearing, they have been sent away unheard; they have applied for a mandamus, and the Judges being equally divided in opinion, they have failed to obtain a writ; they have sufficient reasons for declining to enter upon a new question of privilege affecting the House of Lords; and they now leave it to the authorities, spiritual and temporal, in their respective departments, to apply whatever remedies are required. The promoters are content, in patience, that the case thus treated, but undetermined, should stand on record for all time, as one of *a Bishop-elect confirmed uncanonically, as they believe; of an Ecclesiastical Court refusing to hear those whom it cites to appear; of the law doubtful* in the divided opinion of its Judges; and yet they hopefully *pause for an Archbishop*, now the last remaining authority to whom they can look, to deal with this notorious case as his conscience dictates, and as the call of the Church, so widely expressed, requires.

'We are, Sir, your faithful servants,

'Doctors' Commons, Feb. 26.' 'TOWNSEND AND ROBARTS.'

Other legal questions have also been raised. It is said that the sentence of confirmation was never signed by the late Archbishop, and that it is doubtful whether it can legally be done by a successor, who did not issue the commission. It is also said that 'the Dean of Hereford has appealed to the 'Primate as superior visitor of the Cathedral, and *sede vacante*, 'sole visitor, to determine whether the oaths taken by the installa'tion of Bishops, Deans, and Prebendaries, are binding, or merely 'formal qualifications for office? whether, if binding, the statutes 'of that Cathedral are to be observed? and, if so, whether the 'asserted election of December 28, 1847, can be valid, respectfully 'requesting him to surcease from consecration until this question 'shall be duly settled.'

The following letter raises other legal questions:—

LEGAL OBJECTIONS TO THE CONSECRATION OF DR. HAMPDEN.

To the Editor of the Guardian.

'SIR,—Permit me to call your attention to an objection to the validity of Dr. Hampden's confirmation as Bishop elect of Hereford, which has not as yet, so far as I am aware, been publicly noticed.

'The late Archbishop of Canterbury issued a commission to Dr. Burnaby, Dr. Lushington, and Sir John Dodson, authorizing them to proceed to the confirmation of Dr. Hampden.

'This special commission necessarily superseded the general commission, which the Vicar-General (by his appointment of Vicar-General), had for this purpose. And consequently, for the due confirmation of Dr. Hampden, it was essential that the three commissioners should act, and pronounce and sign the decrees.

'But in fact they did not so: the sentences, schedules, and decrees, were all framed as in ordinary cases, and proceeded in the name, and on the general authority, of Dr. Burnaby, as the Vicar-General; not in the names and on the authority of the three commissioners. And they were signed by Dr. Burnaby alone, as Vicar-General, and were not signed by either Dr. Lushington or Sir John Dodson.

'The proceedings, therefore, were and are void, as *coram non judice*.

'Doubts, let me add, have also been suggested whether, upon the construction of the Act 25 Hen. VIII. c. 20, the confirmation by one Archbishop can be properly completed by a consecration by his successor.

'I need hardly remind you of the serious objection arising upon those provisions of the canon law, which declare confirmations invalid where objectors are not heard.' 'H.'

It can hardly be doubted that Dr. Hampden, consecrated a Bishop, under the existing circumstances, will be continually liable to have his position questioned at law. We much doubt whether every tenant of the see will not be able to set him at defiance as often as he sees fit. What too if the clergy should refuse to attend his Visitations, or to present candidates for Confirmation? The *onus* in these cases would be thrown on the Bishop of vindicating his authority by proving his rightful holding of the see. We believe that from dangers like these, not even the lapse of two years will secure him. Meanwhile (leaving the whole question of the rights of the Church, in the admission of Bishops) we must say a word on this limitation of time. If the Bishop of Oxford is right in his law, a clergyman may publish an open and unequivocal profession of heresy, of infidelity, nay even of Popery, which in some eyes is the worse sin, and if, because he is obscure and the Bishop does not know it; or, because he is poor and the Bishop pities him; or, because he is a friend or kinsman and the Bishop spares him; or, from any other reason, he is not legally proceeded against within two years, there remains nothing more that can be done as long as he lives. We can anticipate that this may be indeed the state of the law with regard to false doctrine; because it certainly is with regard to immorality. We have already alluded to a shameful case, in which an incumbent of the Diocese of Peterborough, being examined as a witness in a civil cause, swore in the most precise manner to acts of habitual gross licentiousness against himself, with all particulars of time and place, and yet no notice at all could be taken, because two years had elapsed since the last instance to which he swore. It is monstrous that members of the very legislature which has passed these acts to forbid the Church to exercise her discipline upon her own members and officers, are yet fond of reproaching her for the laxity of that discipline.

Still there is one circumstance which leads us to doubt whether even this preposterous statute be really, as the Bishop of Oxford and Dr. Hampden believe, a security to him. Dr. Hampden openly professes that his opinions are unchanged since the publication of the 'Observations.' Now, though the publication is now no legal offence, yet seeing that the book is heretical, his declaration that he still holds all that the book expresses is surely a profession of heresy. The fact that he was himself the author makes no difference in this view of the case. Here is a heretical book; and here is a spiritual person who agrees with all that it contains. If this be not heresy, it would seem that a clergyman might safely declare his assent to every thing contained in the Koran, the 'Age of Reason,' or the Canons of the Council of Trent, or the Book of Mormon. It is a grave question, whether Dr. Hampden is not, at least thus far, still legally responsible for the 'Observations.'

And if he is in danger in this particular way, his defenders may no less find cause to look to themselves. Dr. Hawkins, for instance, assumes an almost infallible air, in deciding the orthodoxy of his friend. Has he forgotten his own 'Manual for Christians after Confirmation?' The first edition of this little work lies before us. It teaches, 'We believe in God, who as 'the Father hath made us and all the world—as the Son, hath 'redeemed us and all mankind—as the Holy Ghost, sanctifieth 'us and all the elect people of God;' (page 12.) This doctrine Dr. Hawkins has never retracted—nay, we doubt not that, with Dr. Hampden, he has nothing to retract. It is very true, that he has silently left it out of the later editions, as Dr. Hampden, without any admission of error, omitted some of the more flagrantly offensive passages of the 'Observations.' Of course Dr. Hawkins's doctrine is directly Sabellian. But it is remarkable enough, that the other great disputant upon the same side, Archbishop Whately, has done the same thing. In the first edition of his 'Logic' he avowed the same doctrine in the most open manner. He has never admitted any error, but in the later editions the passages in question are silently omitted.

It really seems a practice of the divines of this school to publish doctrinal statements which, when canvassed, they neither dare maintain nor will retract, but, professing to have experienced no change of opinion, silently expunge the passage. It is not difficult to conceive what Archbishop Whately would say to such a practice as this, if he had detected it in an antagonist. How thick, and clear, and cold, like a storm of hail, would be poured forth his charges, 'falsehood,' 'fraud,' 'dishonesty,' 'general disregard of truth,' 'disingenuously,' and the like. For our own parts, we have no pleasure in calling men liars, though they differ from ourselves; and we believe as a matter of fact, that Archbishop Whately is a man of truth and honesty. Still, the fact remains to be accounted for, and we will propose to our readers a theory which, we think, does meet it. We believe that divines of this school cannot be said to hold any special doctrinal views at all—that is, not as doctrines, as articles of faith—matters of religion. They theorize upon religious subjects and form religious notions; but these neither are, nor do they, in truth, ever take them to be, any part of their religion. If this be so, they are really guilty of no desertion of their own religious belief, when they thus suppress statements which they dare not defend and will not disavow, even though (as in this case) those statements relate to the highest and holiest of all religious mysteries—the doctrine of the ever blessed Trinity. A Catholic Christian who should do this, would implicitly deny his faith. But that crime these men cannot commit, if, as we sincerely believe, they have no faith to deny. Any sound divine would erase a passage in which he had expressed an opinion upon geology, or natural history, if he believed that it would raise an unfounded prejudice against himself and his work, and injure the usefulness of both. Those who class theology with these sciences, rather than as a fundamental part of religion, will naturally, and without sacrifice of integrity, treat it also in the same way.

We have only alluded to the Archbishop's pamphlet, but as it is the sharpest which has been written in favour of Dr. Hampden, we ought perhaps to have noticed it more at length. To supply the omission, we beg to present our readers with two articles of contemporary remarks upon it. The first is from the *Guardian* of Jan. 19:—

'FRIENDLY ADVICE TO AN ARCHBISHOP.

'There is one remarkable characteristic attaching to most of the controversial brochures which proceed from the pen of Archbishop Whately. Philosophy may have done much for the most reverend prelate, but she has not made him good tempered. There issues, to the best of our memory, about once a year, some letter or some pamphlet from Archbishop Whately, for which the external world finds the easiest rationale in supposing that various humours, of an acrid and sharp sort, resident in his Grace's mind, require a periodical vent. There are some persons who account for all ill-humour on stomachic principles. We do not like so narrow a theory. The mind, as well as the body, is subject to perturbations and diseases. There are annoyances which the philosophic as well as those which the corporeal man feels. Dr. Whately attained, we believe, about thirty years ago, to a perfect system of truth. He saw from his lofty eminence mankind wandering in the mazes of error, and darkness and confusion spreading over the whole region of human thought: he himself being in conscious clear possession of the great treasure. Nothing could be more internally comfortable, enjoyable, or serene, than his state of mind.

All this went on about thirty years ago. In the meantime, years have rolled on, and nothing has come of Dr. Whately's possession of truth. He is now what he was thirty years ago—an infallible oracle to himself; but not much more. The world without has never been induced to regard him as such. In the place over which he once contemplated an intellectual domination, a wholly contrary line of thought rose up and expanded: and Dr. Whately looked over with an eye of considerable jealousy from the other side of the Channel upon a growth of ideas which he could not prevent, and which had superseded his own.

'We know not whether it is from this cause, or any other, that Dr. Whately's controversial brochures exhibit that—(we must be pardoned for being plain)—undisguised transparent ill-humour which they do. There is an acerbity, an acrid tone, about them, to which the writer does not even give that outwardly courteous form which some controversialists would have thought it necessary or politic to do. His imputation of bad and abominable motives to his opponents, which occurs in every alternate sentence, shows a puerile, an almost infantine, peevishness. "Poor man!" the reader feels tempted to say, "he is very cross—very cross indeed!" He is never satisfied till he has called his opponents cheats and liars; till he has charged them *point blanc* with a positive, deliberate, intention to delude and deceive. He cannot quit the sweet reproach; it pleases and gratifies him to repeat it again and again; he likes to see it issue from his pen; he sucks *deliciæ* out of it as it proceeds, again and again, with unwearied monotonous iteration, from him.

'We are not prepared to say to what extent this habit of mind in an educated man is analogous to that of swearing in a rude and uneducated one. When common people swear, they do not mean all that their words imply: swearing is their mode of expressing wrath; they mean to say something which they think will, more than anything else, offend and insult their antagonist; they concentrate this intense desire to insult in one monosyllable, and use that one continuously: they cannot be torn from it: it is dear to them. Any frequenter of crowded streets who has occasionally to witness, *en passant*, the rows and quarrels of common people, can testify to their insatiable devotion to one expression, which simply, as it were, symbolizes their spleen; they cannot part company with it for an instant: variety is odious to them: they delight in the purest and simplest iteration. We feel that the utmost delicacy is due in drawing the analogy between this and the other more educated forms of venting feeling, especially as—(and we would not for a moment forget the fact)—a most reverend prelate is the subject of our comments. It is one of the first lessons, however, of philosophy, that the same habit of mind is capable of various forms of outward expression, according to the difference of age, custom, education, and the like. A controversialist who for ever harps upon one hard, coarse, brazen charge of criminality, and is perpetually fixing deceit and imposture upon those whom the commonest candour would tell him are quite as honest men as himself, is, in fact, only using a particular form of expressing spleen. If he would properly examine himself, he would see that he was angry, and that, as the vulgar have their way of expressing their feeling, so he has his.

'It was not, of course, to be expected that Dr. Whately would let slip the opportunity which the present juncture presents of coming forward and aiding the blow which Government is now aiming at those principles which have constituted so long his mental sore. It was too tempting an opportunity to let pass: nor are we inclined to find fault with him for using it. We only criticize his style. We observe in it that inveterate habit which he has contracted. There is the old charge of wilful deceit and fraud, upon which he harps again. He cannot feel easy unless he call his opponents liars, *e. g.*:—

'"It is well known to persons conversant with the transactions which have taken place at Oxford for the last fifteen years *(though, for obvious reasons, many deny what they well know to be true)*, that the pretended heterodoxy of Dr. Hampden's Bampton Lectures *was a mere pretext;* and that the real offence which incensed so many of the members of the University against him was his pamphlet on Dissent, which advocated the placing of that University on a similar footing to the University of Dublin, which affords education to Dissenters."

'Again—

'"*Now the most unscrupulous pettifogging attorney that ever was pilloried for perjury would never resort to the misrepresenting and garbling of a document,* especially when he knew that the document itself was at hand, ready to be brought into court, *if he believed that the genuine document would serve his cause.* Men who have no reverence for truth will yet, when it happens to be on their side, prefer it to falsehood, because they know that falsehood is liable to detection. *The resort therefore to falsification by Dr. Hampden's accusers, would alone furnish a sufficient proof that they themselves did not think the truth would serve their cause.*

'"Further proofs, if further were needed, might easily be adduced, of the *insincerity of many of Dr. Hampden's assailants;* such as the praises lavished by some of them on his Bampton Lectures to his face, in the presence of witnesses now living, and their reference to him (when Divinity Professor) of young men, for solution of their doubts and difficulties on religious points. But what has been said is sufficient to convince those who are open to conviction; and with those who are not, *it would be lost labour to argue. 'Remedia,' said the ancient physicians, 'non agunt in cadaver.'*"

'It will be observed in these passages that Dr. Whately is not content with refuting the opinions of his opponents, but he attacks their persons. He is not content with proving the opponents of Dr. Hampden mistaken; the point of his charge is, they have been wilful, and deliberate, and conscious deceivers. Now, if we consider the known character of many of those who are thus accused, the ridiculous and audacious folly of the accusation would be almost unaccountable, without the help of some such rationale as we have alluded to. The real fact, then, appears to be as we have intimated, and we would with the best intentions call Dr. Whately's attention to it. Let him examine himself impartially. He appears at present quite unconscious of his unfortunate habit of—we have explained what we mean by the term—swearing. We would act the part of friendly counsellors, and advise him to rid himself of it.'

The criticism which follows, is from the *Times* of Jan. 15:—

'Dr. Whately is the most ingenious man of his day. Dun Scotus himself, once as well known in Oxford, could not be more subtle. There are, indeed, some little deficiencies which seem to detract from the value of this praise. First, Dr. Whately labours under a positive incapacity for making a fair statement or estimate of any case more than usually delicate and involved. Secondly, he never succeeds in impressing conviction on an intelligent hearer moderately acquainted with the matter in question. Thirdly, whenever it is possible, he is confuted by the result. The arguments of the Irish Primate, and his friend, Mr. Senior, against an efficient Irish Poor Law, were perfectly irresistible till the people perished by myriads for want of one. On consideration, these deficiencies will be found to affect Dr. Whately's value as a truthful relator and practical adviser, rather than as a first-rate sophist. A power of making one's own case never comes out more than when there are conflicting circumstances to be disposed of. Dr. Whately always makes his own case on the opening of his argument, as regularly as a bird builds its nest in the spring. Dr. Paley began his great work on Natural Theology with the words, "In crossing a heath, suppose I pitched my foot against a stone, and were asked how the stone came to be there?" Dr. Whately knows how to pervert a good model; he creates a world of his own for his purpose. "If we were to suppose some intelligent and high-minded member of the Church to have resided for the last fifteen or sixteen years in some remote part of the world, and to return at this time to his country, &c.;" and then he goes on to dress up his own microcosm as dexterously as stage mechanists can turn the boards of the Adelphi into a world of waters, or Mr. Turner can make a universe of gamboge. It's all a matter of faith. Only "*suppose*" what the artist supposes, and the rest follows as a matter of course.

'We will instance a few of Dr. Whately's suppositions, which he prefixes with all the solemnity of axioms to his argument. We publish both suppositions and arguments at length elsewhere. He supposes that not merely the remonstrant Bishops, but the whole of the ministers and other members of the Church who have remonstrated against the present appointment, do not profess to have read Dr. Hampden's works, and only refer to the alleged University censure; that for these many years there has been no other obstacle to bringing Dr. Hampden to a regular trial for heresy than the real soundness of his religious opinions; that the present demand for inquiry into those opinions has only been grounded on the allegation that there is a *clamour* against them,—a supposition devised for the purpose of introducing a text with an offensive application; that the University some years since, knowingly and intentionally, repealed its censure; the fact being that it was entrapped by a manœuvre of Dr. Hampden's friends into a virtual recognition, but immediately afterwards refused in full convocation to rescind the censure; that the "discovery" and public complaint against Dr. Hampden's works were delayed for three years, till he was nominated Regius Professor, though Dr. Whately himself refers to a very able and energetic appeal to the English Primate against those works, published a year before that nomination, and only one year after the actual publication of the Lectures; that the fact of Lord Grenville having made Dr. Hampden Principal of St. Mary's Hall, and, of three out of five trustees under a particular deed, having, at Dr. Hampden's solicitation, made him Professor of Moral Philosophy, go to prove that the University at large sanctioned the doctrines of the "Bampton Lectures;" that the persons who voted for the censure in 1836, could, if they pleased, have brought Dr. Hampden to a trial in the regular way, according to the existing statutes; it being notorious that those persons had no such power, and were quite at the mercy of the Vice-Chancellor and Heads of Houses, of whom Dr. Hampden was one, on this point; that Dr. Hampden earnestly demanded a trial, the fact being that his personal friends took very good care that there should be no such thing; that in the convocation which passed the censure there was not a majority of resident members; that the circumstance of an objector making a quotation from a work to prove a charge against it, (were it possible, or at least conceivable, to reprint the whole 500 pages from the title page to "the end," in a pamphlet which must be on the bookseller's counter to-morrow, and must be read, as well as printed, with some expedition,) proves that the said objector is worse than "the most unscrupulous pettifogging attorney that was ever pilloried for perjury;" that "many of Dr. Hampden's assailants have been guilty of the insincerity of lavishing praises on his 'Bampton

Lectures' to his face, and referring to his solution of their doubts and difficulties on religious points," &c. You have only to "*suppose*" all this, and if it does not prove that Dr. Hampden's Lectures are reconcileable with the doctrine of the Church, or palatable to most of its members, it proves at least, what is evidently Dr. Whately's most amiable and judicious purpose to prove, that the opposition Dr. Hampden has encountered has been generally malicious and insincere.

'So far from these *suppositions* being generally true, or constituting at all a fair view of the case, we never read a statement more perverted and artificial. We are not going to talk about "pettifogging attorneys," or retort on Dr. Whately any other of his own offensive expressions, because we can make allowance for a man in Dr. Whately's position, and are also of opinion these questions should be treated without reference to personal principles and motives. Dr. Whately feels for Dr. Hampden. *Proximus ardet.* They hold much in common, and it is natural that sympathy for a friend in distress should draw Dr. Whately a little out of his depth as to facts, and a little beside himself as to temper. We will reply with a moderation and candour which we wish he and other writers on his side would imitate. Confessedly, as we have several times observed, there has been great neglect, great inconsistency, considerable mistakes in judgment, and such alloy of ordinary feelings as there must be in all human discussions. It is very true that Dr. Hampden has never yet received either proper *judicial*, or proper *controversial* treatment. He has neither been tried nor confuted. He has been attacked irregularly, so to speak, by fits and starts, as accident rather than the standing necessity of the case suggested.

'The real question, however, is, whether the "Bampton Lectures," and the pamphlet which professes to be a particular application of their views, are consistent with the teaching of the Church of England. If they are, then the whole opposition, whatever its character, be it ever so pious, or ever so malignant, falls to the ground. If they are not, then members of the Church are justified in doing all their abilities, their influence, and their means will allow, to stigmatize the false teaching; and, if possible, exclude the teacher himself from the chief offices of the Church. Every dissenter will acknowledge the justice of this. It is not a question of motives, of character, of conduct—nay, it is not a personal question at all. It is a question of *truth*. Many a man has had a very good cause, but has lost it through folly, or worse. The Archbishop of Dublin does not touch the grave question itself,—he only plunges headlong into the accidents and personalities connected with it. He makes it a wrangle about names and dates, and the wisdom and sincerity of each particular step in a fifteen years' history. Properly it is no such thing. It is a solemn controversy concerning certain books now extant, published, avowed, and defended.'

The fact to which these writers advert is as remarkable as it is notorious. It is as much as your character is worth to differ in opinion from a liberal. You are a fool, an unprincipled liar, a link-boy, a pettifogging attorney, betraying general disregard and unscrupulous recklessness of truth, and what not, before you know where you are. Liberalism is much like the '*congé d'élire*,' it is a free permission to all men to exercise their private judgment, so long as their private judgment votes for the same conclusion to which the liberals have already come. We need not go far for as many instances as will fill a page.

Thus, Archbishop Whately charges all the opponents of Dr. Hampden with 'general disregard,' and 'unscrupulous recklessness, of truth,' because one pamphlet, by a clergyman who never concealed his name, (which, although not on the title-page, is, we believe, well known to the Archbishop) asserted the notorious fact, that the neologian school of Oxford were united not only by agreement, but by intimacy. The publication of Blanco White's Memoirs, Arnold's Life, &c. have since made this fact so notorious, that it is marvellous to find it called in question. All that can be said against it is, that one individual of the school, having left the University very early, was not known to several of the others who formed a compact set there. As truly might it be said, that the Whigs are not now a party because Lord Normanby is at Paris. The passage being in some other respects remarkable, we will extract it:—

> 'The title, as I remember, of one of the earliest pamphlets written against him was, "The Foundations of the Faith assailed at Oxford." One may naturally ask, "of what faith?" Manifestly, the faith of the Tract party, and not that of our Church. For this latter has its foundation on Scripture alone, which is expressly declared to "contain all things necessary to salvation;" while creeds and other formularies are received by our Church, not as a foundation, but a superstructure, "because they may be proved by Holy Writ." Now, it has never been even pretended that Dr. Hampden impugned the authority of Scripture. The "faith," therefore, whose "foundations" he was accused of assailing (and he did assail them very powerfully), is manifestly not that of the Church, but that of those nominal members of it who studiously inculcate doctrines utterly opposed to its fundamental principles.
>
> 'The pamphlet just alluded to I recollect hearing my valued friend Dr. Arnold mention, as affording an instance of the general disregard of truth in the writers of that school. He pointed out to me that the author speaks of a sort of combination of persons, whom he names, to propagate certain doctrines they had agreed upon, being connected together by the bonds not only of community of opinions but by those of intimate private friendship; enumerating, among others, Dr. Arnold himself, Dr. Hampden, Mr. Blanco White, Dr. Hinds, and myself. Now, of all these persons, there was, Dr. Arnold remarked, no one, besides myself, of whom, in reference to him, the above description was not utterly untrue. He never had any particular intimacy with Dr. Hampden; and with Dr. Hinds and Mr. Blanco White he never had so much as a visiting acquaintance. "Not," said he, "that I should have had any reason to be ashamed of such an intimacy, had it existed; but, as it never did, the putting forth of such a fabrication to serve a turn,—to excite suspicions against a supposed clique of intimate friends conspiring together to propagate a certain theological system,—serves to show the unprincipled recklessness of truth of which we have, of late years, seen so many deplorable instances." '

On this we beg leave to remark—1. That Dr. Hampden has been, and is 'accused of impugning the authority of Scripture,' as where he 'appeals from Paul philosophizing to Paul preaching,' and many other passages. 2. That the foundations mentioned in this passage meant neither Scripture nor tradition, nor any other instrument of proof; but as the same word is used in Scripture, those fundamental doctrines which are the subjects alike of Scripture and of Catholic tradition, viz. the doctrines of the Holy Trinity, the Incarnation, and the like; which had been assailed in Oxford by Dr. Hampden, Dr. Whately, Mr. Blanco White, and others, as that pamphlet abundantly showed. 3. Lastly, that when an Archbishop shows so very fresh a resentment against a brother clergyman, as thus publicly to stigmatize him as a liar, after an interval of thirteen years, and without so much as any plausible ground, men in general will be ready to believe that the facts and arguments adduced by the clergyman in question must have come home rather more closely to him than he liked.

As we are alluding to the personal intimacy between the leaders of the neologian school, we will take the opportunity of citing from an independent and talented pamphlet, some remarkable facts with regard to the intimacy between Dr. Hampden and Mr. Blanco White, from the 'Letter to Archdeacon Hare,' by the 'Tutor of a College.'

> 'I must say *in limine*, that I had read, or rather studied these Memoirs (of Blanco White) twelve months before I had met with Dr. Hampden's pamphlet; and that on perusing the latter some weeks before Christmas Day, I was so struck with the similarity of language between the two writers, that I could only account in one way, for the silence observed in the Memoirs as to any intercourse between Blanco White and Dr. Hampden, especially since there was abundant testimony borne to the friendly terms on which he was with Dr. Pusey, and Dr. Shuttleworth, Dr. Hinds, and Mr. Newman, Dr. Whately and Mr. N. Senior, and others. I need not say, that I concluded that the editor of the Memoirs had *suppressed* all notice of the intercourse between Dr. Hampden and his subject. I do not blame him if he did so. But it now appears that they were most intimately bound together, and by this fact the similarity between the arguments and language of the two writers is explained. For a proof of this similarity, I must refer you to the postscript of this letter—you will form your own opinion whether such exists or not, and you will allow that the case assumes a graver aspect, if there be this similarity—if it appear that the arguments whereon Dr. Hampden founded his "Observations on Religious Dissent," are not merely full of error, but are likewise mixed up with the causes which, within a twelvemonth of the appearance of the pamphlet, drove Blanco White to confess that in 1818 he was a Unitarian, and *had never been, by conviction, any thing else in the interim;* that "he had merely *acquiesced* in the established doctrines in 1826, owing to the power of that sympathy, which tends to assimilation with those we love and respect;" that within a short time after this, his reason resumed its sway against the system he had thus *wilfully* re-embraced; "that during the three or four years prior to 1836, he had arrived at the clear unfolding of his views respecting heresy and orthodoxy; that he had frequently declared to his friends that his theological studies had been for many years conducted in the *spirit* of the divines commonly called Unitarians and Rationalists."'—P. 35—37.

The Postscript appears fully to confirm the writer's statement, and our readers cannot, we think, fail to observe the confirmation which the independent conviction of this Cambridge Tutor affords, to the account of the intimacy between Dr. Hampden and Mr. Blanco White, contained in an extract from the *Times* in our last number. Nor is the other fact less important. There are scores of witnesses, that Dr. Hampden and Mr. Blanco White were in habits of daily intercourse while the Bampton lectures were in progress. The autobiography proves Mr. Blanco White's custom of recording and commenting upon the conversations of the day, which in his state of health were often his only events. He tells us too, that at that very period he 'declared to his friends that his theological studies 'had for years been conducted in the spirit of the divines 'called Unitarians or Rationalists.' Why is it that the published book is altogether silent as to any intercourse whatever between him and Dr. Hampden? Beyond a doubt, because his record of the Doctor's free conversation would not bear publication, while he remained Divinity Professor in Oxford. And this conclusion exactly accounts for the disappointment which Mr. Blanco White repeatedly expressed as the Bampton Lectures were preached, and for his complaints that, in Dr. Hampden's position, he dare not openly express what he felt and meant. To others they have ever seemed a bold step in latitudinarian theology: to him they appeared a timid concealing of deliberate convictions. Who, that was not present at the conversations between Dr. Hampden and his Socinian friend, can undertake to pronounce unreasonable the disappointment expressed by the latter at the Doctor's want of courage?

But these remarks have led us away from our present subject —liberal intolerance. From Archbishop Whately we turn to Archdeacon Hare. This liberal divine thought fit, not long ago, to publish a defence of Luther. But, forsooth, he must needs express the deepest contempt, not for the intellectual only, but the moral qualities of all who deny to the Lutheran bodies the title of Churches. Of course he knows how many, whom he must himself know to be among our ablest as well as best men, do deliberately entertain the opinion which he stigmatizes. But what is enough to secure this treatment, they differ, in the present instance, from the opinion of the Archdeacon of Lewes. The same writer, being most courteously answered by Mr. Trower, calls him, '*to a certain extent*, a conscientious man,' because, forsooth, he expresses dislike of the title of a work of the Archdeacon; expressly declaring, in the fulness of his integrity, that he had not read the work itself. This phrase he uses of one who is 'a Rural Dean in our own 'Diocese, highly esteemed, I believe, by all his acquaintance, 'and I know that he is so by my dear brother Archdeacon.' Mr. Maurice again, speaking of Dr. Hampden's opponents, instantly begins: 'Let them beware of shaking their fists at me and calling me a rationalist.' Who had begun, may be modestly asked, to do so?—why threaten where no one has offended? Indeed, among those of Dr. Hampden's opponents whom we have seen, we have found none in whom Mr. Maurice's support of him has excited even a momentary expression of anger or surprise. It was what they looked for. They have never known any such occasion pass by, for a good many years, without eliciting a pamphlet from Mr. Maurice, one very like another. That he would publish, could hardly be questioned; that if he published it would be against the opposition of the Church, was still more certain. For we knew before that, as he says, he could not but disapprove of Dr. Hampden; and disapproving him, it would be common, and almost vulgar, to join with the rest of the Church in protesting against his elevation to the bench. Repulsions may be calculated as well as attractions. We have, on more than one occasion, taken observations upon Mr. Maurice, and have calculated his orbit with a considerable approximation to accuracy. He is repelled from the opinions of other men by a force which varies inversely as some very high power of his distance from them. Consequently, when he is very near to them, the repulsion becomes so great as to be practically infinite; the difference between it and infinity may safely be neglected. Knowing, therefore, how strongly he must agree with those who condemn Dr. Hampden's writings, we felt sure that he would just now be shooting away from them, driven by his law of repulsion, almost into infinite space: he is just now at the most rapid period of his aphelion.

But, to speak seriously, we would recommend the study of this pamphlet to all who are tempted to doubt the sincerity of others, when they see them acting in accordance with their apparent interest, and unable to assign so much as a plausible reason for their conduct. Mr. Maurice is an able, and, we are very sure, an upright man; yet the reasons by which he professes to be influenced, in the line he takes upon this momentous question, would hardly seem sufficient to bias any thinking man in the most unimportant affair of his life. It seems that if he protested against Dr. Hampden's elevation to the bench, he would 'endorse the opinions of all Bishops whom he has not opposed.' Then he does not like censures by convocation, nor extracts from any work, and there have been both here. Besides, some lives of the Saints, which he does not like, were published (anonymously) several years ago at Oxford. This is literally all.

But this article must draw to a close. In labouring to avert from the Church of God the sin and shame of Dr. Hampden's consecration, we have only discharged a plain duty. We have never ceased to hope while the deed remained undone; nay, when done, we will hope still that some authoritative censure may, after all, be pronounced upon his writings. One thing we need, one thing we demand, and have ever demanded—nothing can satisfy the Church, except a full and fair trial and distinct sentence, ay or no, upon their soundness or unsoundness. With these remarks we leave the cause of the Church in His hands who will not leave nor forsake her.

P.S. Since the above article was in type, the newspapers announce that the Protest of the Clergy was received by the Primate on Saturday, and that on the day following, Sunday March 26, Dr. Hampden was consecrated by his Grace, assisted by the Bishops of Llandaff, Worcester, and Norwich; the Bishops of London and Winchester, who generally assist, declining to act on this occasion. That a very grievous blow has been struck at the Church of England, we cannot conceal from ourselves. It is important, however, to observe what it is. This case does not prove that the Minister can force whom he will upon a reluctant Archbishop. Indeed, we hope to show, next quarter, that the whole result of the case is strongly the other way. It shows only (and we deeply regret it) that the Primate and the assistant Bishops are convinced of his orthodoxy. That they should be so is, we admit, a very serious fact, and it is the sole fact of the case.

The members of the Roman Church have so loudly triumphed in this case, that we may request attention to the following article extracted from a contemporary, not because we rejoice in iniquity, but because it shows our suffering and sin not to be without a parallel:—

> 'It may not be amiss to draw attention to the favourable contrast presented, both between the positions of the respective Churches, and more especially between the conduct of the respective Clergy—in the English "Hampden Case,"—as compared with the French appointment of the notorious Abbé (afterwards Cardinal) Dubois to be Archbishop of Cambrai, in the year 1720; a contrast by so much the more remarkable, as the person selected for that promotion was, certainly, incomparably more unfit to be a Christian Bishop than any one now to be found among the whole body of the English Clergy, Dr. Hampden inclusive, or the laity to boot.
>
> 'Dubois was, from his youth up, a professed courtier, a most abandoned profligate, and *an avowed atheist.* Whilst he was in the height of his power as minister and favourite of the Regent Orleans, *and still a layman,* the Archbishopric of Cambrai fell vacant by the death of the Cardinal De la Tremouille, the predecessor of De la Tremouille having been the great Fénélon. The characters of Fénélon and De la Tremouille contrasted so strongly with that of Dubois, that the Regent long hesitated before he could make up his mind to grant the request of his favourite, and nominate him to

the vacant see. He yielded, however, at length, to the entreaties or intrigues of the minister,—who is said to have procured the intercession of George I. of England in his favour—and named him to the Archbishopric.

'Of all the disqualifications of Dubois for the Episcopate, that which *legally* was the most formidable was the fact of *his being married.*

'"He had no trouble, however," says the historian,[1] "in finding a magistrate, (un magistrat,) to take on himself the duty of clearing him from all legal inquiry, in the person of Breteuil, mayor of Limoges. Dubois, when a young man, had attempted to seduce a peasant girl, whose scruples he had at length been obliged to overcome by a clandestine marriage. On his elevation he had prevailed on his wife to take another name, and on receiving a pension, to remove to a distance and live apart from him."

'Breteuil, having plied with wine the curate of the village where the marriage was celebrated, procured the register, and tore out the evidence of the marriage. Thus this obstacle was disposed of.

'"But Dubois was not in holy orders; he wished to receive all the orders of the Church, up to and inclusive of the priesthood, in one day; *but the Cardinal de Noailles refused it as a profanation. Other Bishops came to offer their services.* The Bishop of Nantes was preferred, and Dubois received from him, in one hour, all the orders below and inclusive of the priesthood.

"'*The Cardinal de Rohan then joyously took upon himself the task of consecration.* He was assisted by the Bishop of Nantes, *and by* MASSILLON (!) *Bishop of Clermont.* This *last could plead in excuse* (!) says M. Lacretelle, *his obligations to the Regent* (!!), and the seclusion in which he lived, and which made him ignorant of the scandals too well known to the Court Bishops. The ceremony accordingly took place June 9, 1720, at Val-de-Grace, with great magnificence."

'This was in the age of Bossuet, Fénélon, Armand, Nicolle, and Massillon; and this last even assisted at the ceremony!

'We read of no opposition on the part of the French Church or Clergy as a body; no remonstrance from her Prelates. The Cardinal de Noailles was the only man in all France who dared to refuse participation in so great a scandal, or rather in so great a crime.

'Yet in France there is no act of *præmunire*.

'Which of the two cases shows the more intolerable power vested in the State?

'Which the more abject supineness on the part of the Clergy?

'Lord John Russell's conduct has been indecent enough, but the Church has PROTESTED against it unmistakeably.

'That of the Regent Orleans was simply atrocious, yet it was acquiesced in by the Church of France without a murmur.'

Of this case there can be but one opinion; and it is plain that such things caused, though they did not excuse, much which happened in the Revolution. Our case is widely different, yet, in its degree, very serious. When the body of the Church has resisted, as it has, and when the Primate and three Suffragans have proceeded to consecrate, with the charges unheard and untried, it is certain that one side or the other must be very seriously in the wrong; which that side is, it is not ours to determine. On earth it will be decided by foreign Churches, and posterity; its ultimate decision must rest with Him who is our Judge.

---

[1] Lacretelle's Hist. de France, pendt. le 18me Siècle, vol. i. p. 342, whence the above is taken.

NOTICES.

'SERMONS and Essays on the Apostolical Age,' by Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of University College, Oxford, (J. H. Parker.) We have not space here for entering at large on Mr. Stanley's volume, and must confine ourselves to one Sermon, which seems as much as any other to require notice; viz. the 'Sermon on the Epistle of S. James.' Mr. Stanley, with his usual candour and modesty, indeed, disclaims the origination of the view of the Epistle contained in this sermon, expressing himself as 'indebted to Chevalier Bunsen' for a good deal of it, and refering often to German authors, at the bottom of the page, as his authorities. So that it appears to be the view held by a particular school of German divines; still, as Mr. Stanley has put it forward, it is our disagreeable task to connect it with his name.

Mr. Stanley's view, then, of the Epistle of S. James, makes that Epistle a half Jewish, half Christian, document. He says, 'Not only is the Gentile Christian completely out of sight, but the distinction between Jew and 'Christian is itself not yet brought to view.' 'This Epistle exactly coincides with the character of him (S. James) in whom the Jew and the 'Christian throughout his whole life were indistinguishably blended together.' For this somewhat strange view of an Apostolic Epistle, the reason advanced is, perhaps, hardly less strange. 'Christianity appears in it,' he continues, 'not as a new dispensation, but as a development and perfection 'of the old: the Christian's highest honour is not that he is a member of 'the universal Church, but that he is a genuine type of the ancient Israelite; 'it instills no new principles of spiritual life, such as those which were to 'turn the world upside down in the teaching of Paul and John, but only 'that pure and perfect morality, which was the true fulfilment of the law.' Now, if an Epistle is to be regarded as Jewish, because it exhibits a Christianity which is the development and perfection of Judaism, we do not know what is to save the New Testament, as a whole, from that charge; for, certainly, the New Testament throughout puts the new dispensation before us as the development of the older one. If the religion in the Epistle of S. James is confessed to be in the first instance not Judaism and the law, but the *development* of Judaism, and the *fulfilment* of the law;—what is the 'development of Judaism,' and the 'fulfilment of the law,' but true and genuine Christianity? Why, after acknowledging a developed religion in the Epistle, go back again to the charge of an undeveloped one? Again, 'the Christian's highest honour (as represented in the Epistle) is not that 'he is a member of the universal Church, but that he is the genuine type 'of the ancient Israelite.' The 'genuine type of the ancient Israelite,' being no other than the perfect Christian character; the comparison between the honour which that, and the honour which membership of the universal Church, bestows, would be, we think, a somewhat idle one. Nor does S. James enter into it. He simply draws the Christian character itself, and exhorts men to aim at it. Is to do this alone, and of itself, Judaic? If

Mr. Stanley replies that, though the exhortation to Christian holiness is *not* Judaic, the absence of allusion to the universal Church, and the coming in of the Gentiles *is*, on that view of the Epistle of S. John, the tone of which Mr. Stanley specially contrasts to that of S. James, on the point of Judaism, is Judaic also; for there is no reference there, any more than in S. James's Epistle, to the Universal Church, and the coming in of the Gentiles. Again, 'It (the Epistle of S. James) instills no new principles of spiritual life 'which were to "turn the world upside down," in the teaching of Paul 'and John, but only that pure and perfect morality which was the true 'fulfilment of the law.' *Only* that pure and perfect morality which was the true fulfilment of the law! And what would, in the way of practice, Mr. Stanley expect the New Testament to teach us? If his words, 'new principles of spiritual life,' refer to practice, such new principles, and the true development of old ones, mean the same thing: Christianity has introduced no new original principles in this sense, but only developed and perfected old ones. That love which S. John, that faith which S. Paul taught, were principles which existed before Christianity. If the words, 'new principles of spiritual life,' refer to doctrine, it is enough to say that the mere omision of the mention of certain peculiar doctrines of Christianity, no more stamps a Jewish character upon the epistle of S. James, than the same omission would upon any discourse of the present day. It is not necessary, for an epistle or a discourse to be Christian, that it should contain the whole of Christianity.

Mr. Stanley is struck again with the resemblance of S. James's teaching to that of some of the Jewish prophets. 'It is impossible to overlook the 'likeness of the moral teaching of Amos and Jeremiah, which reappears in 'the *prophet* at Jerusalem.' 'He saw the oppression which trampled on 'the poor, and his spirit burned within him, and breaking through all the 'forms of the Apostolic Epistle, once alone in the page of the New Testa- 'ment, we hear the terrific denunciation of the ancient prophet, delivered 'with all the impassioned energy of an Amos or Joel, "Go to, now, ye rich 'men,"' &c. And, on the whole, he concludes that S. James was 'called 'to fulfil the mission, if I may so say, rather of a Christian Baptist, than of 'a Christian Apostle or Evangelist, to make them believe in Moses, before 'he could make them believe in Christ.' Upon this we have only one remark to make—if to do things which Jewish prophets did, and to say things which Jewish prophets said, is Jewish, then every true Christian is a Jew. An argument which is to prove a Jewish spirit in any book of the New Testament, should surely point to some peculiarities of the Jewish dispensation existing in such a book. If all that the argument does is to point to certain doctrines and precepts in it which Judaism, Natural Religion, and Christianity all hold in common, it does seem to fail remarkably of its aim. If the Epistle of S. James recommended circumcision, or the washing of cups and platters, it might legitimately be called a Jewish document. But it is a very small help to such a conclusion, that it enforces in some parts the universal laws of morality, and the eternal principles of justice, mercy, and truth;—especially if those laws and principles appear in it in that perfect and developed form, which is peculiar to Christianity. Indeed, we seem to see here and there Mr. Stanley himself rather wavering in his judgment on this Epistle, and half revoking it after he has pronounced it. For he admits that 'its *voice* is indeed the voice of the new 'dispensation,' but adds, that 'its outward form and figure belongs almost 'entirely to the older.' But what is the outward form and figure here meant? Is it that of style, phraseology, imagery, &c.? If so, Mr. Stanley's conclusion is not formidable, and would not provoke any serious controversy.

To proceed to some other points, Mr. Stanley, on examining the internal structure of the Epistle, discovers, in accordance with his view of its Jewish tone and character, that it was actually addressed to Jews and Christians equally; and that S. James's flock was a mixed one, composed half of members of the old, and half of members of the new dispensation. 'Both 'are equally addressed in the Epistle as belonging to the twelve tribes 'scattered abroad: it passes at once from rebuking the unbelieving Jews 'of the higher orders, to console the believing Jews of the lower; the Christian assuredly is spoken of under the name of synagogue.' Here are three arguments. With respect to the first;—the expression, 'the twelve 'tribes which are scattered abroad,' shows, undoubtedly, that the persons whom S. James was addressing, were Jews: but it leaves perfectly open, and does not at all decide the question, what Jews they were, whether believing or unbelieving ones, or both. Supposing there is evidence elsewhere that the Jews addressed were believing Jews exclusively, this expression is no evidence that they were not. With respect to the second, viz. that S. James says, (v. 1,) 'Go to, now, ye rich men, weep and howl 'for your miseries,' which rich men, says Mr. Stanley, were unbelieving Jews; which circumstance proves that the Epistle was addressed to Jews and Christians promiscuously; how such an expression as this can prove this conclusion in the case of the Epistle of S. James, any more than the expostulation, Rom. ii. 17, 'Behold, thou art called a Jew,' &c., proves it in the case of the Epistle to the Romans, we do not see. An expression which may so naturally be a mere apostrophe, cannot be any evidence for Mr. Stanley's purpose. Indeed, does not Mr. Stanley himself make it an apostrophe, when he says, S. James here '*breaks through the forms of the Apostolic Epistle?*' With respect to the third, viz. that S. James 'speaks of the Christian assembly under the name of synagogue;'—the word synagogue has two meanings, a particular and a general one. In the particular, it means the Jewish synagogue, in the general it means simply assembly. Now, S. James could not have used it here in its particular meaning, because the 'Christian assembly' certainly was not the Jewish synagogue. And from the general meaning, no inference, of the kind Mr. Stanley wants, can be extracted. Such are the arguments in favour of the Epistle of S. James being addressed to a mixed body of Christians and Jews. On the other hand, is the plain fact that S. James addresses those to whom he writes this Epistle, as believers in Christ: 'My brethren have not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory, with respect of persons.' Again, 'Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of first-fruits of his creatures.' Again, 'Be patient, therefore, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord; stablish your hearts, for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh.'

The strangeness of the view which makes this Epistle addressed to Jews and Christians equally, does not diminish, as Mr. Stanley carries it out into the details of the Epistle. For example;—'My brethren, count it all joy when ye fall into divers temptations; knowing this, that *the trial of your faith* worketh patience,' &c. i. 1—3. The faith which S. James here appeals to is, according to Mr. Stanley, not Christian, but Jewish faith. Without insisting again on the fact that S. James himself expressly calls this faith, (ii. 1,) 'The faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory,'—to make a Christian Apostle appeal to Jewish unconverted faith, not as a preparatory, but as a final faith, ('that ye may be perfect and entire, wanting nothing,' i. 4), does appear to us exceedingly strange. Such, however, is Mr. Stanley's explanation of this passage. 'It was probably 'some immediate practical occasion from which this address took its rise. 'I have said, that early as it might be, the troubles of the last period of 'Jewish history were already beginning; and it might seem, as it has been 'well expressed by a modern historian, as if the skirts of that tremendous 'tempest which was slowly gathering over the native country and metro-'polis of the devoted people, first broke and discharged their heavy clouds 'of ruin and desolation, one by one, over each of their remoter settlements. 'Such, amongst others, was the train of calamities which, about the pro-'bable date of this Epistle, fell upon that vast Jewish population which 'still dwelt in the plains of Babylonia, and which, unlike their brethren of 'Alexandria, still looked to the temple of Jerusalem as the centre of their 'faith, and still regularly sent their contributions for its support. It was, 'as we may suppose, to console and sustain these, or such as these, of his 'countrymen that S. James wrote, just as his predecessors had, in like 'manner, striven to revive the sinking spirits of the different portions of 'their nation, or its kindred tribes, as, one by one, they fell before the 'advance of the Chaldean invasion.' There is one important distinction between the Jews of the Chaldean invasion before, and the Jews of the final and destructive Roman invasion after, the Christian era, which Mr. Stanley here overlooks. The former were God's beloved, the latter were God's cast off people. Mr. Stanley, we cannot help observing, gives the Apostle S. James a very questionable office, in making him the consoler of the Jewish nation, under the approach of that final judgment of God, which its rejection and crucifixion of our Lord drew upon it;—the consoler, without any allusion to punishment or repentance, accompanying his consolation, 'My brethren, count it all joy; the trial of your faith worketh patience: let patience have her perfect work, that ye may be perfect and entire, wanting nothing.' That appears to us a strange explanation indeed of these words, which would transfer them from their generally understood application to the trials of Christian faith, to being an encouraging address to the Jewish nation before God's abandonment of it as a punishment for its apostasy.

Mr. Stanley's theory of this epistle has not a less difficulty again to surmount, when it comes across the much-discussed passage (ch. ii.) respecting justification. The ordinary view of this passage makes it the correction of a perversion of S. Paul's teaching on the subject of faith. The fact that S. Paul's teaching on this subject was mistaken and misapprehended is certain, for the Apostle himself tells us so. And S. Peter alludes to some grievous errors, both of life and doctrine, which had come in in consequence of a perversion of some part of S. Paul's teaching—and what part if not this? So it seems certain that there was an error among the early converts on this point—an error of an antinomian tendency—to be corrected. The passage in S. James is exactly worded so as to correct it. The inference drawn is, that it was intended to correct it: and a very natural inference it appears to be. But Mr. Stanley's theory of this epistle obliges him to oppose this explanation of the passage, because his theory addresses the Epistle to a body over-biassed in favour of the law, rather than against it, and therefore not at all needing to be warned against such an error—a body, viz. half of actual Jews, half of Jewishly prejudiced converts. He accordingly argues against it, thus:—'Still less is it, [the passage in 'S. James,] as some have imagined, a correction of S. Paul. It would 'surely be against the whole order of progress so manifest in the revelation 'of Christianity, if we could suppose that the more perfect statement of 'Christian truth in S. Paul should be intended to receive its completion 'from the less perfect statement in S. James.' Now with respect to this argument, it appears enough to say first, that though S. James's doctrine was not, as no one ever asserted it was, a correction of S. Paul's, it may have been a correction of other persons' perversion of S. Paul's: and secondly, that whether S. Paul's is a more perfect statement of truth than S. James', or S. James' than S. Paul's, or whether both are equal, there can be no reason why S. Paul's statement should not have been *added to* by S. James. Mr. Stanley seems to object to S. Paul's statement 'receiving its *completion* in S. James,' because, a subsequent addition appearing to him to be necessarily the higher and more finishing part of a doctrine, he cannot consent to put S. Paul lower than S. James. But a subsequent addition does not involve any such consequence as this: an addition may be an addition and nothing more: it need not be higher, and it need not be lower, than that which it is added to. Mr. Stanley's argument against the common explanation of the passage in S. James, continues—'It would be precluded 'by the nature of the circumstances under which the Epistle was written. 'So far from its readers being likely to have fallen into an exaggerated zeal 'for S. Paul's assertion that, "a man is justified by faith without the deeds 'of the law," *it is probable* that they had never heard of it at all, or if they 'had, would have rejected it with scorn. It was, *as we have seen*, a far 'different teaching which they needed.' That is to say, Mr. Stanley refers us back to his own *hypothesis*, with respect to this Epistle, as a whole, for the disproof of the commonly received explanation of this particular portion of it. He first supposes a particular class of religionists which this Epistle addresses, and then says that such a construction of a passage is not a true one, because it was not adapted to this particular class. He makes his hypothesis prove its own results, and rejects any opposite results on the ground of inconsistency with such hypothesis.

And now to proceed from Mr. Stanley's refutation of the received explanation of this passage, to the assertion of his own. S. James, he says, is here correcting, not the licentious faith of the mistaken Christian, but the barren faith of the formalist Jew. But surely, on Mr. Stanley's own showing, the Jewish mind was just the mind which did *not* require this correction from S. James. It had no exaggerated estimate of faith, as compared with works, to be reproved. The formalist Jew was only too extreme in his view of justification by works already, and therefore why should S. James be so particular in pressing that view upon him, as if he denied or neglected it? Mr. Stanley's own argument has undercut his own explanation, before he gives it us. If, in reply, he proceeds to discover *a particular aspect* in which the Jew may be *contemplated* as holding just the contrary error, and thinking more of faith and less of works than he ought; if, he says,—'this false faith showed itself in a desperate trust in their 'privileges as the people of God, like the Mahometan belief that death in 'battle for the faithful is a passport to heaven,' &c. All that need be asked is, is this the aspect in which the Jew is put before us in the New Testament? In the controversy on faith and works, is the Jew represented as taking the side of faith, or taking the side of works? If he is represented as on the latter side, however Mr. Stanley may, by means of some peculiar aspect of his own, contemplate him as taking the former, it is evident the Jew must be taken as the New Testament exhibits him. And being on the side of works, S. James's remonstrance, which charges them whom it addresses with thinking too exclusively of faith, is hardly applicable to him.

Thus Jewish a character, and thus Jewish an audience, does Mr. Stanley give to S. James's teaching in this Epistle. He seems to agree, however, with Luther, in thinking that 'there are in it many good sentences;' and to regard the teaching as, though not of the highest kind, very solid and useful. 'It is not without its use to have a proof that the ordinary "rules 'of familiar" intercourse, of words, &c. were not thought beneath the 'notice of the earliest address to the Christian Church, It may be instruc'tive to see the national and social duties,' &c. &c. But we must gravely ask, could Mr. Stanley have properly weighed and considered the whole of the Epistle of S. James, before he selected the line of apology which he has in one part of his Sermon? Could he have weighed and considered such texts as—'Let patience have her perfect work:—The trial of your 'faith worketh patience:—If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, 'who giveth to all men liberally and upbraideth not; but let him ask, 'in faith, nothing wavering:—Every good gift and every perfect gift is 'from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights:—Of His own will 'begot he us with the word of truth:—Receive with meekness the en'grafted word, which is able to save your souls:—Visit the fatherless and 'widows in their affliction, and keep himself unspotted from the world:— 'Have not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of Glory, with 'respect to persons:—Whosoever shall keep the law, and yet offend in one 'point, he is guilty of all:—Who is a wise man, endued with knowledge 'among you, let him shew out of a good conversation his works with 'meekness of wisdom:—The wisdom which is from above is first pure, 'then peaceable, &c.:—God resisteth the proud, and giveth grace to the 'humble:—Submit yourselves to God:—Draw nigh to God, and He will 'draw nigh to you:—Humble yourselves in the sight of the Lord, and He 'shall lift you up:—Be patient, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord;

'stablish your hearts, for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh:—Is any 'afflicted? let him pray; is any merry? let him sing psalms:—The prayer 'of faith shall heal the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he 'have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him:—Confess your faults 'one to another, and pray one to another, that ye may be healed:—The 'effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much:'——Could Mr. Stanley have really weighed these texts before he penned the following apology for S. James's Epistle.

'How often are we obliged to acknowledge the great usefulness of books 'which are yet without the tone and feeling which we ordinarily expect 'from religious men? How often have we heard of persons, who having 'been by circumstances separated from the religious world, with hardly 'even a religious expression on their lips, have yet been so earnestly 'employed in works of honesty or justice or benevolence, that we cannot 'but think of them as having been engaged in the service of God! It is 'in contemplating such cases as these that the Epistle of S. James may be 'considered as most useful, both as a warning and an encouragement. It 'teaches us not to condemn at once those whose life and teaching is formed 'on the model which God has been pleased to set before us in the life and 'teaching of S. James.'

The apology continues in much the same tone,—'Undoubtedly, its [the 'Epistle's] one pervading characteristic is, that its whole object is entirely 'moral: that the same energy of language, the same authoritative tone, 'which in other parts of the New Testament are used to inculcate what we 'strictly call religious truths, are here used to insist upon those plain 'matters of right and wrong, of vice and virtue, which, strictly speaking, 'are hardly called religious at all.'

Will Mr. Stanley seriously say—that perfect patience, unwavering faith, undoubting prayer, receiving with meekness the engrafted word, remembering that we are begotten with the word of truth, rigid government of the tongue, visiting the fatherless and widows, keeping ourselves unspotted from the world, seeking the wisdom which is from above, exhibiting it with meekness, submitting ourselves to God, drawing nigh to God, humbling ourselves in the sight of God, waiting for the coming of the Lord, praying in affliction, praising in joy, confessing our sins one to another, interceding in prayer for one another—are 'such plain matters of right and wrong, of vice and virtue, as strictly speaking we hardly call religious at all!'

We shall conclude with two brief remarks. One is, that however sincerely Mr. Stanley may vindicate for the Epistle of S. James its place in the canon, we cannot but consider his view of the Epistle, as a modification of the view of one who displaced it—we allude of course to Luther. Another is, that if the teaching of S. James is considered Jewish; what is our Lord's teaching to be considered? And what epithet are we to apply to the Sermon on the Mount? For Mr. Stanley acknowledges that S. James faithfully reflects our Lord's teaching; that he writes 'in the true 'spirit of that Divine discourse in S. Matthew's Gospel, which is the true 'model of his whole teaching;' and 'preserves almost verbally the traces 'of the teaching of his Divine Master.'

Mr. Allies' second edition of 'The Church of England Cleared from the

Charge of Schism,' is, in fact, a new work. It has grown from 300 pages to 500. It is a theological treatise, instead of a pamphlet. The powerful, though, from the circumstances of the case, hasty and incomplete argument of a defensive essay, written to meet the immediate claims of controversy, has been matured, expanded, and elaborated, into a systematic inquiry into the patristic idea of the Roman Bishop. Apart from its temporary and controversial interest, it now claims an important place in English theological literature, as perhaps the fairest, the most thoughtful, and most exact exposition, that has yet been given of the sentiment of the early Church and its Doctors on a most momentous point of ecclesiastical polity. The substance of the former edition is incorporated in the present; but the argument is exhibited with greater method and clearness; important points which before were only touched on, are brought out with due force and prominence; and much that is actually new, added, such as the discussion of the causes which changed the primacy into a monarchy—the link connecting the modern with the ancient view of Rome. With respect to the early times, no significant fact, no important saying, no recorded opinion or line of action of fathers and councils, but receives full examination. In point of form, this edition is a great improvement on the first, as it is fully provided with those extremely important aids to a book's usefulness—carefully divided chapters and sections, a good analytical table of contents, running titles, and marginal summaries. Into the argument itself we have already entered at length in a former number; we have only now to add, that the book is unanswered; for *to state a counter-theory* is not to answer. But this writer does indicate the real nature of the Roman ground—which is, not to deny that advantage was taken of circumstances to alter the place of the Roman Pontiff in the Church, but, that the place claimed by the Pope is *necessary* in the West, and therefore of Divine right in the whole Church. On the principle, not unknown indeed even to the *historical* controversialists of the days of Trent, that the apparent necessity of the case implies a Divine sanction, and not on antiquity, rests really the Roman case; however they may *argue*, this is what they *reason on*. And it is for them to see to it, whether, as Mr. Allies puts it, '*a divine right* can be constructed out of a series of successful encroachments,' however those encroachments are explained.

We find that a localized Cambridge Architectural Society has been formed. Their first formal production is before us in 'The Arrangement of Parish Churches considered;' (Meadows.) Besides this, an Architectural and Archæological Society for the county of Berks is in the field. As usual, these new bodies are surprisingly active;—their secretaries compose for them new 'manuals of Gothic architecture;' and enthusiastic members rub, classify, exhibit and present 'brasses.' That the aspect of bustle which the proceedings of the first organizers of a Society exhibit has been in many instances, and may be again, the prelude, (necessary perhaps in these days,) to real work, is certain. May it be so in these cases! But some reflections are pressed upon us by the formation of so many of these Societies, which we may as well lay before our readers. First, what good may be expected from them? Doubtless the one or two active men, who must be the nucleus of every such attempt, have a sincere desire to spread information, and to excite a proper feeling as to the building of new churches or the repairing of old. So far as they succeed in doing this, they do good. To our disgrace it must be still owned, that many of our ancient churches are in a state of shocking profanation; and that many of our new ones do not deserve the name. New local Societies do at least stir up people's minds on these subjects. Without a doubt, all round Aylesbury pews will here and there begin to lose their locks, then their doors, then get lowered, finally disappear: altars will be rescued from being hat-stands, kept clean, mended, and before long restored, raised, railed in, and regarded as sacred. Fonts will be brought again into use, their drains cleaned, plugs provided and covers carved;—and so on. And when a new church shall be wanted, neighbouring incumbents will talk scientifically of styles, and take sides about architects; the Bucks Archæological Committee will sit in judgment on the plans; and the building will come out with sacrarium and sedilia, stone pulpit and stalls—the admiration of the county paper, engraved in the *Illustrated London News*, described at large in the *Builder*, and, probably, snubbed in the *Ecclesiologist*. Good results all these. What, however, is the other side of the picture? It is the danger of a 'little knowledge.' If Christian Architecture is a science, it is not to be acquired by a royal road, but by earnest work and patience. Nor is it now possible—as eight years ago it was necessary—for learners to enter upon the study as upon a voyage of discovery. There is now a great deal of knowledge already acquired and systematised, which must be learnt before further discovery can be made. We think it an unpromising sign, then, when new Societies—as in some brochures that we have seen—appear to desire to have the credit of laying down independently and originally the rudiments of the science. Of course it would be most commendable to test every step by personal examination of ancient buildings. It was only by legitimate induction from a host of facts, collected with the greatest diligence and digested with much thought, that the principles of ecclesiology were laid down as we now have them by the earlier Societies; a similar course must be pursued by all who wish to equal them, not to say outstrip them. We do think, therefore, that persons ought to approach these studies in the spirit of learners, and should avoid anything like presumption while their knowledge is yet crude and shallow. The cases are already far too numerous, in which designs for new churches have been much impaired by the interference of self-constituted judges, and restorations effected, without competent knowledge, in the most unsatisfactory way. We only abstain from giving examples from a wish not to be invidious. The best way of avoiding such mistakes would surely be for the smaller Societies to consider themselves as merely associated for mutual instruction and study, rather than as qualified, by virtue of their yearly subscription, to be judges of taste and art.

And this leads us to speak of the older Societies, and of our regret that some plan for making them work more in concert has not yet been hit upon. It is a subject to which we have already called attention. The progress of the science is retarded until some better organization shall become effective. In the meantime each of the more important bodies seems to us to require a word of counsel. The Ecclesiological, or Cambridge Camden, Society keeps its periodical organ at the head of the movement, and may be allowed to point to that work as the chief—we had nearly said the only—evidence of its efficiency, or of its existence. But surely its members ought to make more efforts to supply,—what is really wanted, and what no other body can supply, unless one should be started in opposition to themselves,—a centre of information and point of union for those interested in similar objects in London. In this way, too, they would command an audience which would enable them to take the lead more decidedly and beneficially among their sister associations. The Oxford Architectural Society continues to exhibit its ordinary amount of zeal and activity, and with respect to its collections and museum must be, we should suppose, the richest of all. We think its chief defect is the want of uniformity in its architectural creed. So far as we have seen, there are very few principles or ruled points to which the Society is committed: its opinion on a given question could never safely be guessed at upon general rules, for there are none by which it is bound. As an example, it has, so far as our knowledge goes, no recognised nomenclature: a majority of its members using the exploded and unphilosophical system of Rickman, while the more reasonable system of the Camdenians, or the terminology of Professor Willis, is only occasionally allowed to enter into the formal language of their reports.—The Exeter Diocesan Society, which is the next in importance, displays, as always, a well regulated energy, and appears to have managed its finances more wisely than any. It has never lost the impetus which it received from Bishop Medley. Its publications are highly creditable. There are branch associations now established in connexion with this Society, which seem really to work well and practically.

Deadness has overtaken several other once promising shoots: because they lived, as they originated, only in individual zeal. It is an age since the public has heard anything of the Bristol, Yorkshire, Durham, Lynn, or Lichfield Societies. The Northamptonshire and S. Albans Societies are also now entranced, though it is a less time since they were originated, and therefore their active hour is fresher in our remembrance.

One word more of advice to them all. The only place in which their reports and proceedings are chronicled, is in the pages of the *Ecclesiologist.* This is so convenient a plan, that we hope that magazine will continue to insert them, and that the reports will be carefully prepared and officially furnished. There will be thus a friendly rivalry, and the science must benefit from the systematic registry of all that is done or said in its behalf. Moreover, separate reports, even if their publication can be afforded, cannot have a wide circulation: we ourselves, for example, should have no opportunity of generally seeing them, nor could we engage, however much we might want them, to hunt them out in the columns of a newspaper. In fine, we recommend that it should be attempted to make the *Ecclesiologist* —we select this periodical because it is in existence and has done good service—the organ of the whole science, in a wider sense than is now the case. An obvious practical difficulty in the way of such a scheme, arising from the responsibility likely to be incurred by one body for what is done by another, might surely be met by accurately distinguishing the pages for which alone each is answerable. This we say, not from any wish to dictate, but from our real interest in the progress of the science, and our conviction that, particularly in these times, the condensation of homogeneous publications into one more economical form is an advantage to all parties concerned. A number of separate scientific works can rarely be remunerative, never lucrative: and the fewer purchasers, the fewer converts. Union is strength.

That there is a large amount of money, time, and zeal thrown away, or even misdirected, by a vast number of unauthoritative bodies, calling themselves 'Architectural Societies,' acting without concert, and upon a very slender stock of technical knowledge, is obvious. Two things are wanted: to fuse all local Societies into a General Board; and to fix that Board in London.

The Incorporated Church Building Society is understood to have come to a resolution which, in common with all interested in the improvement of church architecture, we must own that we deplore. About a dozen architects—of different degrees of reputation—have been assigned to various districts of England: each will have to report on works engaged in by the Society in his own district; and a Committee of the whole number, chosen according to a cycle, and meeting at fixed times, will examine every plan which is submitted to the Board. A very bad principle is thus introduced; viz. the constituting a professional tribunal for the examination of the designs of other architects. It is not fair to compel an artist to submit to this sort of inspection. Of the architects who have accepted the Society's offer, probably no two agree as to what is the best style, plan, or arrangement of Churches. Imagine the value of the result out of their different views. It may happen also that the designs of the most distinguished among them will fall under the inspection of their least qualified colleagues. The Society was perfectly justified in employing a professional surveyor to report on the construction of the designs, on which they had to grant money, as was the former arrangement: but even that plan often worked ill. Their adviser fatally marred many a good design by needlessly insisting on tie beams. The proposed inspection, however, is much more objectionable; and, if it works, will be found to be the cause of great and deserved discontent among the less favoured members of the profession. Another evil is to be apprehended from the assignment of districts to particular architects; which is, the monopolizing of work in those localities by the gentlemen so connected with them. This evil has been already found to result, we believe, from the appointment of diocesan architects in some cases; also from the government scheme of district surveyors in London, against which the whole profession reclaims. Of course, it may so happen that under this arrangement a good architect will be very extensively employed; but the contrary is also possible, and is a greater evil than the other is a good. For, in an open district, there is no reason to think that an equally good, or perhaps better architect might not often be called in: which we have more grounds for hoping because of the rapidly growing knowledge and taste in Church architecture; but a reign of authorized mediocrity is a miserable prospect, since few will have the courage to risk losing a grant by discarding the recognised architect of the district.

The whole truth of the matter is very simple. It is, that the board and the staff of the society obtained office and authority before anything was known scientifically of Church architecture. They now begin to feel their deficiency, and very honourably, and we believe with the best intentions, are attempting some remedy, which, were they themselves qualified, would not be required. No architect would refuse to submit his designs to the decision of a competent unprofessional tribunal. On the other hand, such a board as all would have confidence in might surely be chosen out of the Incorporated Society. The remedy is as simple as the disease. Let competent knowledge in architecture be alone the qualification for election to that branch, sub-committee, or what not, of the Church-Building Society, to which is reserved judgment on designs. At the same time, when we point out what we think a mistake, let us not be thought insensible of the zeal and piety and disinterested services of the distinguished persons who have managed this society. Only Church architecture is like other sciences: proficiency and capacity to decide upon designs does not come by nature. Christian art has standards and fixed principles, like music or grammar: prettiness, or our own likings, are not its rules. That the Society has acknowledged this, by asking for professional advice, is something; but that it should commit itself to *such* professional advice of perhaps the very men who brought Church Architecture to its miserable state of ten years ago, and from which it has only been rescued by non-professional learning and study, is wonderful. Let it not be forgotten that the architects have followed the movement: they had not originated, scarcely had contributed to the literature, or to the science of the revival. Let it be conceived that Rollin, Crevier, and Mitford should be constituted a board to report upon the works of Niebuhr, and something like this result would come of it.

'The Monumental Brasses of England,' (Bell,) of which three monthly parts have appeared, are a series commenced by Mr. Boutell, whose name should have attracted him, one would have thought, to the more strictly architectural rather than the 'brass-rubbing' department of archæology, to the window rather than to the floor. All admirers of brasses, however, should patronize his book; for the engravings, though of wood, are very beautifully executed, and seem to be most accurately given. The examples are of all kinds, ages, and places; each complete, description and all, on one page, so that they may hereafter be arranged in chronological or other order. If the work will but pay its expenses, there is no reason that every existing brass of sufficient value should not in time be engraved in this uniform style, and at a very inexpensive cost. Unfortunately, the scale to which the brasses are reduced is not the same in all the examples.

A very useful, classed, and descriptive catalogue of the rubbings in the possession of the Oxford Architectural Society, 'A Manual for the Study of Monumental Brasses," (J. H. Parker) has also appeared. It originated in the short descriptions of their annual acquisitions in this line, drawn up by the Committee; but it has now expanded with the addition of a useful introduction into something akin to a scientific treatise. The introduction passes in review all the classes of these monuments which have survived destruction, their chronological distinctions, with their bearings on costume and the different stages of Christian art. A good deal of learning and research, mostly accurate, is exhibited in the notes and references. An inaccuracy caught us at p. xxiii. 'During the first five centuries the 'ecclesiastic vestments were the same as the ordinary dresses of laymen.' We are quite aware that this has been stated: but then, how to reconcile it with what in this very book is laid down at p. xxv. that 'the 'Albe is mentioned in A. D. 398, and was originally worn by all orders of 'ecclesiastics?' that 'the Council of Laodicea, A. D. 364, directs the use of the stole' (p. xxvi.)? that 'the chasuble was established as a priestly and ecclesiastical vestment before A.D. 474" (p. xxvii.)? To which we might add, that the dalmatic is mentioned in the acts of S. Cyprian, and that many eminent ritualists, we are not saying that we follow their reasons, concur in finding a direct allusion to the sacerdotal vestment (τὸν φαιλόνην,) in ii. Tim. iv. 13.

Mr. Ernest Hawkins has published a delightful book, in continuation of a valuable series, 'Annals of the Colonial Church.' (S.P.C.K.) The present volume is occupied with the Diocese of Toronto only. It is composed from authentic documents, Missionaries' journals, and the like, to which the writer's official position gives him access. The genuineness of the details is therefore unquestionable. One reflection suggests itself from this and similar works: that the practical character of the Church of England has been misunderstood even in days which it is so ruled a point to underrate as those of the last century. The genius of a Church is not to be estimated altogether by its literature, still less by its town clergy. London parishes are not the best index of our clerical temper. The present book illustrates our remark. The life and tone of one Mr. Langhorn, a Canadian missionary, A.D. 1787—1813, we honestly believe represents the true character of the Church in its rural districts—that is, in its diffused spirit—much more faithfully than the sermons of our popular divines. Robert Walker was but the type of a class; one of surpassing dignity and individuality. The stern, rough, yet scholarly statesmen of the North were something more than mere boors. Combined with apostolic poverty, they exhibited somewhat of apostolic severity and truthfulness of character. They were uncompromising men. Langhorn is stiff, racy, and full bodied in character. We wish that we could extract his biography. Rough work requires rough tools, which, though rough, have other qualities. A back-woodsman's axe has something more than its mass of metal, it has temper as well as weight.

An 'Epitome of the Bampton Lectures of Dr. Hampden' (Masters), is, what it pretends to be, drawn up in the author's own words without note or comment. From the same quarter we have just received a responsible pamphlet, 'Propositions in the Bampton Lectures.' The author, Mr. Irons, gives his name: it is a name known, and upon which reputation depends. He openly charges Dr. Hampden, to whom he addresses himself, with denying not only the elements of the Christian, but of any, religion. Such an appeal demands some notice.

In the Hampden matter a pamphlet of pretence, defending the high regal and *præmunire* line, has, significantly enough, appeared from one of the liberal Professors of the London University College in Gower Street, Mr. Creasy. Its title is 'Sub Rege Sacerdos' (Taylor and Walton). It displays but little legal research; and, as an illustration of the author's capacity of judging the value even of contemporary documents, we may mention that he speaks with approbation of Mr. Christmas's most contemptible publication on the subject.

'Visitatio Infirmorum: by Messrs. W. H. Cope and H. Stretton,' (Masters,) is a valuable and important work. It should be combined with a book published a few years ago, in two parts, by a pious layman, 'Devotions for the Sick Room.' The present work is strictly *ad clerum:* the other, as its name signifies, is for private use. We have felt, occasionally, in reading it that, as perhaps in the case of all manuals, it should be used rather as a specimen of what is needed, than as a collection of forms to be employed unvariably and literally. The variety of style and language incidental to a compilation varying from the ancient manuals, and S. Anselm, down to living writers, is occasionally perplexing: and there may very well be cases in which the language of Andrewes, or even Kettlewell, is open to some formal difficulties. We allude, not to the prayers and litanies, which it is a deep satisfaction to use in the very words, either of the Church, or of its saintly servants, but, to the exhortations, warnings, and the like. That the present collection is the result of actual practical experience, as a very engaging preface shows, is not its least value. Throughout, it is imbued with a careful reverential feeling: and is a considerable advance, both in fulness and general Catholic tone, on its many predecessors. We felt—the authors, perhaps, may in some measure be disposed to sympathize with us—a blank at concluding the work, 'Exhortations to the Nurses and Friends,' 'To those who mourn for the Death of their Friends;' but not a word of duties still remaining towards the departed themselves. In a work like this, debateable subjects would have been misplaced: we make no complaint of their omission in the present work, but in this place we can, which the authors of a devotional work cannot, afford to say how severely our practical—not, we are assured, our theoretical—system tries those who feel that the grave closes neither our Christian offices or communion towards those who are still alive to God as they were in the sick room.

The Rev. George Smith, late a missionary in China, and author of an 'Exploratory Visit to the Consular Cities of China,' (whatever they may be) —we only copy his own description of himself—has favoured us with, 'Hints for the Times: or, the Religions of Sentiment, of Form, and of Feeling, contrasted with Vital Godliness,' (Hatchard.) No. 1, 'the sentimental religionist . . . . soars on the wings of imagination into the starry heights of heaven, and contemplates, in the ardour of intellectual enthusiasm, the myriads of sidereal orbs.' No. 2, who 'is told of a joint rule of faith vested in certain ancient writings, which his intellectual pride leads him to study . . . . embarks on the voyage of life the zealous bigot of forms, and the bitter opponent of evangelical truth.' No. 3, seems a female variety of No. 1, who goes to a ball after confirmation. Mr. George Smith, before he 'embarked on the voyage' to China, takes credit to himself for not having spent his time, which he passed at 'Magdalen Hall, Oxford,' in 'the seats of academic learning, engaged in the honourable competition of literary emulation.' We can quite understand that there are many people who have very positive reasons for sneering at 'the absorbing engagements of human science, and the increasing thirst of literary distinction.'

Our own pages have shown that we cannot agree with Mr. C. B. Pearson, in his 'Thoughts on the Management Clauses,' (Cleaver,) but we must do him the justice to say, that he has written a well-tempered pamphlet. Mr. Pearson seems to feel that, with our present divisions, the proviso of giving the sole management of schools to clergy, 'who may substitute Dr. Watts's Catechism for the Church's . . . . and who, perhaps, being friendly to the Evangelical Alliance, would neither teach the creeds, nor the liturgy, nor recognise the distinctive doctrines of the Church of England,' p. 14, is as great a risk as that of a managing school committee. He also hints that 'circumstances might arise' when the 'exercise of a visitorial power by a Bishop,' might be 'far from the most impartial and satisfactory mode of settling disputes,' p. 19. So he thinks that, on the whole, the chances for orthodox schools are as great with lay as with clerical management.

'Archæologia Hibernica,' (M'Glashan,) is a very usable manual of Irish antiquities, 'Pagan and Christian.' The author is Mr. W. F. Wakeman. Irish 'Ecclesiology'—to adopt a term which we are nearly driven into, much as we dislike it—yet asks an historian. That Dr. Petrie is quite capable of the work, we fully believe. The engravings of the present little work are good, and the illustrations most important. The patriotism of Ireland is taking a very practical line in its historical and antiquarian investigations: this will serve as a set-off against certain other phases of the national character.

'The Servant's Claim upon the Christian Master,' (Longman,) is an important subject not very well treated by Mr. C. Sangster, Curate of High Hoyland.

'The English Reformation,' by Mr. Massingberd, (J. W. Parker,) has reached a second and much enlarged edition. The work is too well known to require more than this announcement.

A pretty book has appeared, 'Songs of the Holy Land,' (Ollivier.) To say that it reproduces Lockhart and Macaulay, is what the writer would as fully admit, as we could urge. In poetry, as in painting—we are not ashamed of the hacknied parallel—art has schools: if we cannot get Giotto, or Raffaelle; Giottesque or Raffaellesque, as they call them, are admirable things in their way, and, to all but practical critics, or the keenest judgments, nearly as good as the original types. So these poems are very,—not more than, but still,—successful academy studies after the 'Lays of Rome:' it is a good school, and pleasing in all its scholars. An objection has been made against this collection, as against all scriptural poems: if good for anything, it lies also against scriptural paintings; for, surely, a poem is only another form of picture, or, rather, picture and poem are only a meditation realized; an idea embodied. That there are some Scriptures too sacred for mere verses, a rendering of a portion of the Canticles, p. 56, which ought never to have been written, proves. Altogether, we feel in the volume a deficiency of nature: the pieces are clever echoes, but hardly natural songs. The diction and costume are not quite oriental: *ex. grat.* in one of the most spirited, the 'Battle of Gilboa,' the whole scenery is classical: the tumultuary fights of Palestine were never characterized by the legionaries' 'serried strength'—the

> 'Tall groves of glittering lances,
> Long walls of brazen shields.'

Again: neither Seir nor Jael are monosyllables; the conventionalism which has appropriated such words as Saul to this incorrect form, must not excuse the vulgarism which we detect in—

> 'Who smote the might of Amalek in Kishon's pleasant dale,
> And bowed the neck of Sisera beneath the foot of Jael.'

But as we would be on good terms with the author, and desire that our readers should share in our general satisfaction, we will extract the dignified opening and conclusion of—

THE WIVING OF ISAAC.

I.

'Now Abraham the Hebrew
Is stricken well in age,
And the Lord, his God, hath prosper'd him,
In all his pilgrimage:
Yet to his kindred far away
The old man's breast doth yearn,
And to that good and pleasant land
Where he may not return:
His father's land and pasturing flock
In nightly dreams he sees,
On the plain amidst the rivers,
In Ur of the Chaldees:
And for his son, his Sarah's son,
The hope his heart within,
Is, ere he die, to wive him
With a maiden of his kin.

XI.

Went Isaac forth to meditate
At balmy eventide,
When lo! that hour the camels came
Were bearing home his bride,
Came onward from the wilderness
Between two opening files,
With soft and solemn motion,
And music low of bells;
A white-veil'd maiden after
Came bashfully and slow,
And the bridegroom's heart was comforted,
Her comeliness to know;
And soon within his mother's bower
His gentle fluttering dove
Unveil'd the glory of her eyes,
And listened to his love.'

—though we feel that the concluding metaphor hardly suits the mighty matron of such an age.

Mr. Wilson Evans is one of whom no Churchman can speak in other language than that of distinct respect. Of his 'Scripture Biography,' the first two series appeared, and with good success, many years ago, in Rivingtons' Theological Library. We have to announce the publication of a 'Third Series,' from the same publishers. The same warm glowing language, the same fecundity of illustration, marks the continuation. But we cannot conceal from ourselves the need of a more chastened severity. Mr. Evans has, in his late publications, avoided what, we think, are grave defects of composition in his former works: but, in the present volume, probably for the sake of symmetry, he has returned to his early and gaudy manner. His colours are too rich and fervid: his narrative lacks repose and unity of design. He neglects drawing and outline. As has been said of Shakspere, he hunts a metaphor to death; no matter where it carries him, he will see the last of a figure. An illustration of our meaning occurs at pp. 329, 330. 'Its (Crete's) maritime situation lay open to the free importation of all that was bad in the known world; for so, alas! it is, that good is always an export, but hardly ever an import. How should it be, when human corruption presides over the custom-house of the world?' This is a cold *concetto* worthy of Cowley, or rather of his imitators. Of other glittering passages of questionable taste, this specimen occurs at p. 19: 'Verily, the law is not dead. It is alive along its whole line of history. Trains of events from brilliant cars. Characters are their drivers: and all is heavenly spectacle, holy shout, and inspired agitation.' At times, Mr. Evans writes so rapidly, that he leaves grammar behind him. 'Here Moses commenced the second period of his life, which includes three, of forty years each,' p. 30. Three what?—'periods,' of course; but 'period' is the only antecedent. And, which is a more serious objection, this pleasing author trusts too much to his own acuteness and sense of the picturesque, too little to the received and Catholic interpretation. Of course, Scripture must, in Scripture biography, be interpreted at once: in a work of this character we do not expect all the interpretations. But, in announcing a sense of very serious and important passages of revelation, some hints ought to have been given that the interpretation adopted by Mr. Evans is not the only one. Thus, in the matter of the Three Holy Children, Mr. Evans asserts without hesitation, or apparent consciousness of the difficulty, that the fourth personage seen in the furnace was the second person of the Trinity. If we are not mistaken, the general stress of Catholic authority interprets the appearance of a created angel. It is certain, as Dr. Mill somewhere reminds us, that there is very great danger in systematically resolving all Angelophany into a manifestation of the Trinity; and he strongly condemns Bishop Heber, among others, for this fault. At any rate, in this particular instance, Mr. Evans will find the authority, perhaps the preponderance, of very great names against him. Neither can we concur with Mr. Evans in classing 'the works of the Schoolmen' with 'the childish legends and quibbling comments' of the Talmud, p. 288. A single page of Thomas Aquinas, or of Peter Lombard, would be well bestowed on a writer so right-minded as Mr. Evans, and we should have been spared his contemptuous question, 'Where are the works of the Schoolmen?' Where they always will be, among the Church's most treasured possessions. But let us part from Mr. Evans in a respectful attitude. We have gathered so much, both in the way of instruction and interest, from his many beautiful works, that we almost shrink from criticism in the case of one whose reputation and gifts are so deservedly valued. But to be only just, his very faults are winning, and his style attracts and retains the reader, in spite of the difficulties urged by his judgment. And of all our present writers, none are more consistently pious and practical than Mr. Evans.

'The Bell; its Origin, History, and Use,' by Mr. Alfred Gatty, is very properly published by Bell, of Fleet Street. To speak in botanical nomenclature, it is a monograph of the genus Bell. We miss Quasimodo, and the bells of Notre Dame—also some allusion to the pretty tunes which used to be played on a frame of hand-bells about London, some years ago. The book is a most pleasant and readable one. We present Mr. Gatty with a classical eulogy from Persius, of which he will appreciate the conceit, 'Euge tuum et belle.'

Mr. Bennett has edited—we do not know who is the writer of—a first volume of 'Lives of certain Fathers of the Church,' (Cleaver,) chiefly for the instruction of the young. It provokes an obvious comparison, under which most writers would fail, with the 'Church of the Fathers.' A dull or unprofitable book on such a subject were impossible: the present is more than this. It is attractively written, and quite answers the object which it proposes. A foot-note at p. 11, is so awkwardly worded, as to seem to make Petavius—M. Denis Petau, the Jesuit, whom Bull found such satisfaction in goring—an early writer of the fourth century.

Dr. Wordsworth has published a sequel to his 'Letters to M. Gondon,' (Rivingtons,) in which he takes occasion to reply to his Reviewers, among whom as we have not been, we stand in an impartial position. It is an able collection, though we should have preferred less asperity of tone. Recent events have done much to help Dr. Wordsworth's argument as to the 'destructive character of the Church of Rome in polity,' *i. e.* state polity. The conduct of the Clergy in the present revolutionary *débacle*, we may acquire a clue to; but, at present, it utterly staggers and perplexes English Churchmen.

'Ecclesia Dei,' (Longman,) ought never to have been written.

'The Lord of the Forest and his Vassals,' an Allegory, (Masters,) is quite an average specimen of the allegorical class of compositions.

The amiable and warm-hearted author of 'Proposals for Christian Union,' which we have spoken of with sympathy, has pursued his subject, in 'Claims of the Church of Rome considered with a view to Unity,' (Darling.) Feathers dropped from the dove's wing deserve to be treasured, and if we are not so sanguine as Mr. Appleyard, it is a difference between us, because we rest rather upon the judgment than the feelings. We cannot see the encouraging tokens on the other side, which we would gladly detect. Such facts as the gradual extinction of the Parisian school of the Sorbonne divines—the expansion given in some quarters to the extremest theory of the *cultus* of the Virgin and the Saints—the policy of adopting both Bossuet and Petavius, Möller as well as Bellarmine, the principle both of Mr. Newman and Vincentius, according to emergencies—the singular fact that the present chaotic state of Europe must be traced directly to Pio Nono —the anti-monarchical principles in state government which are so freely embraced where they can be made subservient to the consolidation of a still sterner spiritual autocracy—these are things which we cannot ignore. Neither must the identity of principle between Bunsenism and the prospective development of doctrine be forgotten as a very serious omen against the likelihood of comprehension.

Another pleasant selection from Andersen, 'The Dream of little Tuk,' (Grant and Griffith,) with curious illustrations by Count Pocci, has come out. The adaptation of Chamisso's story of the 'Shadowless Man,' is clever.

Mr. J. B. James has published 'Thoughts on Passages from the Fathers,' (Rivingtons.) Being entirely of an ethical character, they cannot but be sound and practical. It is not an attractive book: each thought being only a sort of attenuated sermon—a sermonet, as we once heard such compositions called.

'The Services at the Communion Table considered, by Philo-Biblion,' (J. W. Parker.) A *re-opening* of the discussion on the Rubric question will remind some of Ritt-Master Dalgetty's 'Bows and arrows! ha! ha! —have we Robin Hood and Little John back again!' Philo-Biblion is a bold man, although 'not in the habit of writing for the public eye, as the deficiencies in style and in language, and in the want of arrangement of his little book, bear full evidence,' as he candidly (p. 9,) and truly, assures us. He *considers* the characteristics of 'Gospel doctrine to be their clearness and simplicity,' p. 26. He also has 'reason to fear that some of the Fathers, whose authority is now quoted' 'may be included in the censure of St. Paul, *as having at the time when he wrote already fallen away* from the true faith,' p. 7. On the Vestment question, Philo-Biblion is great and original, especially on the 'obligation of the minister to retire to change his dress at the end of each service.' 'The gown,' we are informed, 'has been substituted for the *hood* in the pulpit,' p. 30. About what he calls 'The Communion Table,' a word which does not occur in any rubric or ritual direction of the Church whatever, here is a new view: 'The table ought to be prepared for communion at the end of the service for the Decalogue,' p. 35. 'Unless the table is prepared for the communion, there is no Lord's Table,' p. 43. 'Psalms are to be sung while the minister is arranging his dresses, and changing his situation in the Church,' p. 31. In our ignorance, we had thought that the common Sunday office consisted of three parts—Matins, Litany, and the Liturgy: it is quadripartite, we find; 'the office for the Decalogue . . . . cannot be considered part of the Sacramental Service, but must be taken as a separate and distinct office,' p. 30. Having substituted the term 'reading-desk,' for 'reading-pew,' in the Commination office, our author decides that 'desk' means 'an enclosed seat;' and 'that a movable *lecturn*,' (*sic*,) always has 'two desks to sustain the Bible and the Prayer-book,' p. 97. Perhaps he derives this word '*lecturn*,' from to 'turn:' as his objection is something about 'the minister turning his back,' and 'returning to the lecturn.' Probably the book is only an elaborate satire upon the literature of the party whose rubrical views it professes, or pretends, to represent or caricature: certainly, 'the defectiveness of arrangement, the deficiency of style, the feebleness of argument, and the inelegance of language,' (Pref. p. v.,) which the author, no bad judge, owns to discover in 'this little work,' are characteristic enough. A judgment pronounced in such a quarter we are not called upon to disturb.

A 'Bengal Civilian' has favoured us with 'Some few Thoughts on Reason, Revelation, and Faith,' (Smith, Elder and Co.) This writer has mistaken his vocation; he may be a very good civilian, but he is a very heretical theologian, having compounded into one unpleasant puzzle, Sabellianism, Pelagianism, and Socinianism. For the former element he professes himself indebted to Dr. Whately's discussion of the word 'Person.'

Mr. Grover, of Hitcham, has published a thoughtful and curious pamphlet, 'A Voice from Stonehenge,' (Cleaver.) Only the first part has appeared. The writer traces Druidism to the Panchæans of Ceylon, mentioned by Diodorus Siculus. He has strangely misunderstood one phrase of Diodorus, (lib. v. c. 42, tom. i., p. 364, Ed. Wesseling,) ἀπο γὰρ τοῦ πρὸς ἀνατολας *ἀνήκοντος ἀκρωτηρίου φασὶ θεωρεῖσθαι την Ἰνδικὴν ἀέριον, διὰ τὸ μέγεθος τοὺ διαστήματος*, which is thus translated, p. 99 :—'From a promontory of this island towards the East, it is said *the Indian haze* can be just observed through the distance.' This has nothing to do with Indian, or any other, haze; it merely means, 'India can be seen, lifted up, as it were, in the air, by reason of its distance.' We cannot class the present as other than a mere theory, to read the amazing riddle of Stonehenge. A grove, for example, was necessary to the Panchæan worship. Can any one believe that Salisbury Plain was ever a forest? To support his theory, Mr. Grover has again mistranslated Diodorus: either he sees everything with a trilithic eye, or his Greek is wofully deficient: *ὁ δὲ ναὸς*, says Diodorus, (c. 44,) speaking of the great Panchæan, or Cingalese, temple, *ὑπῆρχειν ἀξίολογος ἐκ λίθου λευκοῦ, τὸ μῆχος ἔχων δυοῖν πλέθρων, τὸ δὲ πλάτος ἀνάλογον τῷ μήκει· κίοσι δὲ μεγάλοις καὶ παχέσιν ὑπήρειστο.* 'The temple itself claims particular admiration for *its white stone*, of which the length is two plethra, or 200 feet, and the breadth in proportion: *this stone* is supported by large massive pillars,' &c. p. 106. A prodigious block indeed! Well may the astounded interlocutor, for the book is written dialogue-wise, express some doubts about 'a single stone of such enormous proportions!' Mr. Grover lives very near Eton; we beg to suggest that the next time he wants his Greek translated, he had better send for a boy from the lower fifth, who would tell him that the above passage should run: 'The temple, built of white stone, is very remarkable, being (*i. e.* the temple, not *a* white stone,) two plethra long, and of a proportionate width; it (the temple) is supported by large massive columns.'

With all his singularity of view, no candid mind will deny Mr. Sewell the credit of a sincere and earnest devotion to the Church, and a readiness to sacrifice in her service, time, money, and energy. The stamp of his handiwork, though it may sometimes provoke a smile, ought never to raise a prejudice of condemnation. And works of such magnitude as S. Columba's, and S. Peter's at Radley, undertaken at so much cost, and in so free and generous a temper, may well expect more than a hasty consideration. If we are debarred from stating some of the practical difficulties which are likely to interfere with such institutions, when the *vivida vis* of the founder is withdrawn, we may frankly own that their general object—the establishment of a school on a true Church model—cannot be too highly commended. The energy of Mr. Sewell, the noble self-sacrifice of some of his assistants in the work, demand our love and admiration. If it is difficult to hope, it is impossible not to wish, for complete success. The characteristic 'Journal of a Residence at S. Columba,' by the Rev. W. Sewell, (J. H. Parker,) will produce interest in every reader—a smile, perhaps, from not a few. However, the grotesque is on the surface; the real and religious is pervading and penetrating.

Mr. Keble's affecting 'Prayer for Unity'—so well known to the readers of the valued preface to his recent volume of Sermons—has been printed for use in a detached form, (J. H. Parker.)

'Claudia and Pudens,' (Rees) by Archdeacon Williams, is an attempt to show that Claudia (2 Tim. iv. 21) was a British princess.

From America we have received the important 'Journal of the General Convention, 1847.' New York: (Dana.) It is quite plain that in the way of consolidating and enlarging Church principles, this synodical meeting exceeds its predecessors. The case of Bishop Onderdonk remains in painful perplexity. Were we disposed to be critical, we should regret in our daughter-Church an over anxiety to be legislating. *De minimis non curat lex*, is a good maxim. Perpetual revisions cannot meet every possible case; and we suspect that what the United States want, is rather a recognition of the principles of the settled ecclesiastical law of our universal Christendom, than an over anxious solicitude to meet, or to anticipate, difficulties in their isolated shape.—'The Ends and Objects of Burlington College,' (Morris) is an animating lecture, by Bishop Doane, which esteemed name reminds us of the important mission of Dr. Ogilby on the subject to this country. The Bishop of New Jersey is just the character to whom belongs of right the honour of building up the whole cycle of Christian education on Church-principles; it is due to his warmth of spirit. We believe that the American Church is ripe—at least in its more favoured aspects—for a fuller development than it has yet ventured on. As such, we hail the collegiate scheme, already known widely, and, as we trust, to be generously supported.—From Dr. Ogilby himself, we have received an introductory 'Address to the Students,' (Dana) delivered at the annual matriculation of the General Theological Seminary, the institution of which Dr. Ogilby, as Professor of Ecclesiastical history, is a distinguished ornament.—Two Church Almanacks, one published by the Tract Society, and one by Stanford and Swords, have also reached us.

Dr. Peile, of Repton, is publishing 'Annotations on the Apostolical Epistles.' (Rivingtons.) Parts I. and II. on the Romans and I. Corinthians have appeared.

'The Gospel Narrative of Our Lord's Ministry,' (Rivingtons), is another volume of the delightful series, now six in number, of Mr. Isaac Williams' deep and most religious commentary. It is too well known and valued to demand more than an announcement.

The excellent series of 'Decorated Windows,' (Van Voorst,) undertaken by Mr. Edmund Sharpe, only wants the ninth and concluding part, too long delayed, of its completion. If mouldings constitute the scholarship of ecclesiastical architecture, in window tracery consist its rhythm and cadences. There is something as satisfying to the eye, as absolutely refreshing and physically delightful, in following the graceful curves of decorated tracery, almost playfully reproducing themselves in an endless, yet always graceful variety, as in listening to the swell and pause, the rise and fall of Virgil's metre. The mechanical skill showed in the engravings, is only equalled by the taste which the selection of examples evinces.

'A Vindication of the Church of Scotland, in reply to Mr. Drummond,' (Ollivier,) and 'A Critical Analysis,' &c. (Ollivier,) both by Mr. James Christie, of Turriff, are highly satisfactory pamphlets. If anything, which we doubt, could convince those for whom they are written, these publications would do it. On the Scotch Church question, we also recall a sensible and valuable pamphlet, by Mr. Robert Montgomery, 'The Scottish Church, and the English Schismatics.' *O si sic omnia!* A third edition, 'The Gospel in advance of the Age,' (Edinburgh, F. Clark,) by the same writer, professes 'to have adopted a more subdued tone of controversy, and to have removed certain acrimonious expressions.' If this be a diluted edition, the reader must draw a formidable inference as to the strength of the undiluted one.

Mr. Webb's long-promised work, 'Continental Ecclesiology,' (Masters,) has appeared in a sumptuous form.

The two concluding parts of Mr. Blackburn's handsome work on 'Decorative Painting,' (Williams,) equal their predecessors in beauty of illustration—perhaps exceed them in the quality of the descriptive letter-press. Great pains and research are shown throughout the series; though we still have to regret some unscholarly words, such as 'tempo,' 'nomal,' &c. A second volume we find promised: and the work, new of its kind, deserves encouragement.

'Noctes Dominicæ, or Sunday-Night Reading,' compiled by the Hon. Sir Edward Cust, (Rivingtons,) we have only just received. Enough, however, we have seen entirely to sympathize with the author, though 'a man of the court and camp,' in his wish to produce a work of selections suited for family use on Sunday evenings. There is a simplicity and earnestness in the writer's, or rather selector's, address which commends itself. The title is not over well chosen: reminding, as Sir Edward admits, of certain 'Noctes Ambrosianæ.' Soldier-like, however, he is not to be frightened at such an association: but, in a straightforward manly way, he announces himself to be neither Sabbatarian nor Puritan, but 'an Anglican to the bottom of his heart,' with cheerful views of the Sunday: Patrick, Wogan, Louth, Horne, and Jones of Nayland, whose marginal names we observe, ar a guarantee for the doctrine.

'The Choral Responses and Litanies of the Church of England,' &c. (Bell), by Mr. Jebb, being authentic recensions of various Litany Chants hitherto preserved traditionally, or in inaccessible MSS., admit no question as to their value even in an antiquarian light. That the present publication has a higher use than to the mere student, we maintain: for, of all services, a Litany is least suited to the ordinary and offensive reading which is so common in our parish churches. Nature dictates a specific tone for the more earnest supplication. In the preface, as in all Mr. Jebb's publications, may be detected peculiarities, a discussion of which on this occasion we decline; preferring to recommend, even without drawback, this handsome and erudite volume.

In our last quarter's enumeration of the publications originating in the tedious *affaire Chirol,* we omitted to notice, because we had not seen, by far the cleverest publication of the collection, an 'Answer to Dr. Wiseman's Letter, &c. by a Bachelor of Divinity.' (Rivingtons.)

'Loss and Gain,' (Burns,) is a religious, or rather a controversial story.

The loss, is that of friends and associates; the gain, that of communion with the Church of Rome. We have so often objected to this form of polemical writing, when adopted on our own side, that we shall run no hazard of being charged with a bias, if we continue our objection in the present instance. If 'Loss and Gain' exceeds the less ambitious specimens of its class in point of clearness, it stands on the ordinary level in its one-sidedness and assumptions. In some particulars we are pained to discover something apparently akin to irreverence. Some minds are so constituted that they can abstract the broad palpable impression from a statement, and view it under some subtle contingent medium. Thus, that under any circumstances, our Lord's words to Judas, 'That thou doest, do quickly,' should be cited in defence of the rapid recitation of the words of consecration, can hardly be excused on the refined ground of their ultimate connexion with that act of sacrifice. The keen enthusiastic relish, the sharp intellectual smacking of the lips, with which, in drawing the favourite dilemma between Rome and infidelity, the infidel arguments are dwelt upon and expanded, is another not agreeable feature in the book. It must, of course, have occurred to a writer of such acuteness, that, where the tongue of the balance oscillated with such delicate vibrations, though, in his case, it at last settled on one side, in another case it might swing on the other. We observe this the rather that, after all, he converts his hero by something which is left doubtful, whether it is not an express revelation; and brings in a kind of hazy miraculous interposition to aid the argument:—a mode of proceeding which, however natural in an ordinary romance, is strangely out of place in a controversial novel.

'The Little Red Book of the History of the Irish Church,' by Mr. R. King, (M'Glashan,) is a compact and sound manual. For the fanciful title and red paper cover, which occasions it, we can see no sufficient reason. Of the fact that the ancient Irish Church did not admit the Papal supremacy, we make no question: but is there authority for stating that the 'ancient Irish respected Jerusalem as the Mother Church of the whole world?' p. 41; *i.e.* in any other sense than even an ultramontane would do so. Because, if there is any documentary evidence for the Church of Ireland acknowledging the supremacy of the oldest patriarchate, it would be very important. Mr. King, we think, would do well to consult one of Ireland's chief Bishops—we mean Usher—before he pronounces, (p. 43,) 'prayers for the dead'—especially in their 'very early' form—to be 'among the more serious errors.' This book is written for the use of national schoolmasters: the Anglo-Hibernian dialect, therefore, is not altogether out of place. But such a phrase as this is odd to English ears, 'Henry VIII. was a bad man, ... but when the Pope treated *himself* unjustly, and tyrannized over him, he resolved,' &c. p. 75.

'The Bishop of Fredericton's Primary Charge,' has been published, (Simpson).

Of Sermons we have seen, Volumes, 'Village Sermons,' by Mr. R. D. Rawnsley, (Hatchard); 'The Christian Life,' by Mr. R. Cresswell, (Martin). In the publication of single Sermons, we are glad to report a favourable lull.

INDEX TO VOL. XV.

(NEW SERIES.)

ARTICLES AND SUBJECTS.

A.

American Poetry [Griswold, Bryant, Willis, Emerson], 300—352. Poetry is local and national, 300. Peculiarities of America, 301, 302. Its liberalism, 303. Bryant, 304—307. American pictures of Nature, 308—316. Willis, his facility, 317. His failures, 318—320. Hilhouse, 321, 324. American precocity, 325. Holmes, Bright, Whittier, &c. 326—328. Longfellow, 329. Inappropriate imagery, 330—332. Greene, 334. Poems of humour, 336. Instanced in Willis, 337—341. Female poets, Mrs. Sigourney, Mrs. Brooks, 342, 343. Cranch, 345. Emerson, 346—352.

B.

Blunt's Undesigned Coincidences, &c. 410—432. Conditions imposed on the Hulsean Lecturer and Christian Advocate, 410—414. Professor Blunt's work, 415. Its Argument, 416, and Contents, 417. Criticism of the work, 418—432.

Borneo [*Brooke's Journal*, &c.], 20—55. Insular isolation, 20. The Tropics, 21. Account of tropical climate, 22, 23. Brooke's Journal, 24, 25. Character of Mr. Brooke, 26. His Expeditions, 27—31. Sarawak, 32. Borneo, 33—35. The Dyaks, 36. The Malays, 37. Descriptive extracts, 38—54. The Church in Borneo, 55.

Bunsen, Chevalier [*The Church of the Future, Arnold*, &c.], 56—92. Connexion of Arnold and Bunsen, 56. Their sympathy, 57, 58. Apostles of the new Church, 58. This title examined, 59. Constitution of the new Church, 60—64. Examined, 65, 66. Creeds, and Doctrine, 67, 68. Ordinances, 69—72. The priesthood, 73—81. The individual and collective priesthood, 82—87. Identity of view between these writers and Dr. Hampden, 88—92.

C.

Conington [*The Agamemnon, translated by*], 433—447. Translation and philological illustration, 433. Difficulty of the translator's task, 434. The first ode, 435—437. Criticised, *ibid.* Specimen of the dialogue, 438, 439. Political bias of Æschylus, 440. Conington's Notes, 441—446. Subjects for translation, 447.

G.

Glass Painting, Hints on [*by Mr. Winston*], 1—19. Revival in ecclesiastical externals, 1. Individual pursuit of art, 2. Division of the work, 3. Distinctions of painted glass, 4. Periods of glass, 5—9. The author recommends a new style, 10—12. Subjects for glass-painting, 13—16. Criticism of the work, 18, 19.

H.

Hampden, Dr. and the See of Hereford [*various pamphlets*, &c.], 213—253. Oxford feuds, 213. Their connexion with Dr. Hampden, 215, historically traced, 216—219. Selection of Dr. Hampden for the Episcopate, 220. Lord J. Russell's probable motives, 221—224. Remonstrance of the Bishops, 225. Signs of hope, 226. The Premier's reply, 227. Bishop of Exeter's answer, 228. Dean Merewether's Memorial, 229. The Capitular Election, 230. Principles involved in the contest, 231, 232. Statute of Henry VIII. 233, 234. Dr. Hampden's Letter to Lord J. Russell, 235. Dr. Hampden's Orthodoxy, 236. His connexion with Blanco White (from the *Times*), 237—240. His letter examined, 240, 241. State of the contest, 242, 243.

Appendix of Documents, 244—253. Protest of the Bishops, 244. Lord J. Russell's reply, *ibid.* Protest of the Laity, 245 Lord J.

Russell's reply, *ibid.* Bishop of Ripon's Letter, 246. Dean Merewether's Memorial to the Queen, 246—248. Sir G. Grey's acknowledgment, 248. Dean Merewether's Letter to Lord J. Russell, 248—253. Lord J. Russell's reply, 253.

Hampden, Dr., the Hampden Controversy [*various pamphlets,* &c.], 448—499. Subject continued from p. 253, 449. Details of the Capitular Election, 450, 451. Address to Lord J. Russell from the Bedford Clergy, 452, 453. Lord J. Russell's reply, 454, 456. Dr. Whately's interference, 457, 458. The Premier's reference to the Primate, 459. The Premier's policy, 460. Reference to Mr. Davison, 461. Principles at stake, 462. The Premier's motives, 463. Address of the Heads of Houses to Dr. Hampden, 464. Letter of Bishop of Oxford, 465—469. Dr. Hampden's Letter to Faulkner, 470. Dr. Hampden and Bishop of Oxford, *ibid.* Dr. Hawkins interferes, 471—474. Bishop of Oxford's proceedings examined, 475—478. Confirmation at Bow Church, 479, 480. Appeal to the Queen's Bench, 481. Protest of the Objectors, 482—484. Protests of 1650 Clergymen, 484, 485. Legal Objections, 486—488. Criticism of Dr. Whately's pamphlet (from the *Guardian*), 489, 490. Ditto (from the *Times*), 491—493. Dr. Hampden's connexion with Blanco White, 494, 495. Archdeacon Hare's pamphlet, 496. Mr. Maurice's pamphlet, 497. Consecration of Dr. Hampden, 498. Value of the fact, *ibid.* A Roman Catholic parallel, 499.

J.

Jane Eyre, [*an autobiography, by Currer Bell?*] 396—409. Probably by a female author, 396. Writes from experience, 397. The writer's bitterness, 398. Power of character-drawing, 399, 400. Scenery, 401. Failure in portraiture of manners, 402. The present the age of Novelists, 402—405. Responsibility of novel writers, 406. Applied to Jane Eyre, 407—409.

L.

Luther, Martin [*Life, by Michelet, ditto by Audin, Hare's Mission of the Comforter*), 93—188. Opposite views of Luther, 93. D'Aubigné's Biography, Audin's, Michelet's, 94. Luther's practical character, 95. His melancholy, 96. His aspirations, 97. Human helplessness, 98, 99. Tendency of moral goodness, 100, 101. Sense of imperfection, 102, 103. Application to Luther, 104, 105. The dogma of man's natural depravity, 106. Its application to Imputation, 107. Practical view of this doctrine, 108—110. Lutheran view of Justification, 111. Faith, extra-moral, 112, 113. Catholic doctrine of Faith, 114. Its incompatibility with Luther's view, 115, 116. Completion of Luther's system, 117. Luther's Life, 118, 119. Character of the age, 120, 121. The Indulgences, 121. Luther a Reformer, 122. His history, 123—133. Position of Luther, 134—136. The war with Rome, 137. His coarse vituperation, 138, 139. His constitutional bias, 140—142. Luther's theory of individual priesthood, 143. Luther creates a new Society, 144—146. Excesses of the Reform movement, 147—149. Its doctrinal extravagances, 150. Especially on the Eucharist, 151, 152. The Epistle of S. James, 153—156. Luther's licence with respect to marriage, 157—160. Hare's Apology for Luther, 161. This Apology examined, 161—166. Luther's morbid temper, 167—175. Failure of the Reformation oppresses Luther, 176—178. Effects of Luther's works on Germany, 178—180. Luther's private life, 181—184. His nationality, 185. Practical consequences, 186, 187. Recapitulation, 188.

M.

Madeira, English Church in [*various pamphlets,* &c.], 189—212. State of Madeira, 189. Position of the English Church abroad, 190, 191. The Consular Stations and the Act 6. Geo. IV. 192—194. Lord Campden's Summary of the Church Controversy in Madeira, 195—208. What ought to be done, 209—212.

P.

Pantheism, German, its influence on Criticism [*Strauss, Michelet, Mill,* &c.], 353—395. Hegel and Strauss, 353. Projected development of Christianity, 354. Dr. Mill's refutation, 356. Pantheism derived from Gnosticism, 356. The Mythus, 357. Its connexion with Brahminism, 358. Idealism, 359—362. Defective Christology of Strauss, 363—365. Angelic nature, 366. Strauss's Criticism, 367, 368. Its application to the Genealogy, &c. 369—383. Importance of the subject, 384. Its speculative import, 385—390. Its practical results, 390, 391. Coleridge, 392. Dangers arising from this school, 393—395.

S.

Stanley's Sermons and Essays on the Apostolic Age, 500—506.

T.

Testament, New, Study of the Greek Text of [*Grinfield, Scholefield, Forster, Green,* &c.], 259—299. Learning required of the English Clergy, 259—261. Absence of any Theological Courses in the Universities, 262. Neglect of the Greek text of the New Testament, 263, 264. Importance of such study, 265—276. Method to be adopted, 277—281. The Hellenists, 282—299.

SHORTER NOTICES OF BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

JANUARY.—Forbes' Considerationes Modestæ et Pacificæ—Wilkinson's Analysis of Butler's Analogy—Keble's Sermons—Bishop of Exeter on Scripture Readers—Gulliver's Travels—Dunster's Tales from Froissart—Neale's Stories from Heathen Mythology—Adventures of a Fly—Simple Tales for the Young—Flower's Tales and Legends—Progress of the Church since the Reformation—Beauties of German Literature—Balaam and his Ass—Cope's Illustrated Edition of Watts's Hymns—History of the Hebrew Monarchy—Chalmers' Posthumous Works—Humphry's Commentary on the Acts—Woodward's Short Readings, &c.—Mrs. Hamilton Gray's History of Rome—Publications by Messrs. Bennett and Chirol, &c.—Churchman's Diary and Kalendar, &c.

APRIL.—Stanley's Sermons and Essays on the Apostolical Age—Cambridge and Bucks Architectural Societies—The Incorporated Church Building Society—Boutell's Monumental Brasses—Oxford Manual of Monumental Brasses—Hawkins' Annals of Colonial Church—Epitome of Hampden's Lectures—Propositions from ditto—Sub Rege Sacerdos—Visitatio Infirmorum—Smith's Hints for the Times—Pearson on the Management Clauses—Archæologia Hibernica—Sangster on Master and Servant—Massingberd's English Reformation—Songs of the Holy Land—Evans' Scripture Biography, Third Series—Gatty on the Bell—Lives of Certain Fathers of the Church—Wordsworth's Letters to M. Gondon—Ecclesia Dei—The Lord of the Forest—Claims of Church of Rome considered—Anderson's Little Tuk—James' Passages from the Fathers—Services at Communion-table—Thoughts on Reason, &c.—Voice from Stonehenge—Sewell's Journal—Keble's Prayer for Unity—Claudia and Pudens—American Publications, Dr. Ogilby, &c.—Peile's Annotations—Sharpe's Decorated Windows—Christie on Scottish Church—Webb's Continental Ecclesiology—Blackburn's Decorative Painting—Noctes Dominicæ—Jebb's Litanies—Answer to Dr. Wiseman—Loss and Gain—King's Book of the Irish Church—Bishop of Fredericton's Charge—Sermons by Rawnsley, Cresswell, &c.

R. CLAY, PRINTER, BREAD STREET HILL.

UNIV. OF MICH.
DEC 6 3: 1906

A 414980 DUPL

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
3 9015 02699 6184